NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

Congressional Information Service, Inc.
Washington D.C.

CIS

S. Hrg. 99-817

ENTRANCE FEES AND RESOURCE PROTECTION FOR UNITS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, RESERVED
WATER AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 2130

TO PRESERVE, PROTECT, AND REVITALIZE THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

S. 2204

TO AMEND THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED, TO PERMIT THE USE OF PARK ENTRANCE, ADMISSION, AND RECREATION USE FEES FOR THE OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

JUNE 12, 1986

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
63-652 O WASHINGTON : 1986

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

S311-55

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

JAMES A. McCLURE, Idaho, *Chairman*

MARK O. HATFIELD, Oregon
LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Connecticut
PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico
MALCOLM WALLOP, Wyoming
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
FRANK H. MURKOWSKI, Alaska
DON NICKLES, Oklahoma
CHIC HECHT, Nevada
DANIEL J. EVANS, Washington

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON, Louisiana
DALE BUMPERS, Arkansas
WENDELL H. FORD, Kentucky
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
JOHN MELCHER, Montana
BILL BRADLEY, New Jersey
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV, West Virginia

Frank M. Cushing, *Staff Director*
Gary G. Ellsworth, *Chief Counsel*
D. Michael Harvey, *Chief Counsel for the Minority*

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Reserved Water and Resource Conservation

MALCOLM WALLOP, Wyoming, *Chairman*

LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr., Connecticut
CHIC HECHT, Nevada
MARK O. HATFIELD, Oregon
PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico
FRANK H. MURKOWSKI, Alaska

DALE BUMPERS, Arkansas
JOHN MELCHER, Montana
BILL BRADLEY, New Jersey
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico

James A. McClure and J. Bennett Johnston are Ex Officio Members of the Subcommittee

Tony Bevinetto, *Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

Page
S. 2130 2
S. 2204 18

STATEMENTS

Baucus, Hon. Max, a U.S. Senator from the State of Montana 45
Bingaman, Hon. Jeff, a U.S. Senator from the State of New Mexico 60
Cheney, Hon. Dick, a U.S. Representative from the State of Wyoming 61
Crandall, Derrick A., president, American Recreation Coalition 141
DeConcini, Hon. Dennis, a U.S. Senator from the State of Arizona 32
Durenberger, Hon. David F., a U.S. Senator from the State of Minnesota 37
Hatfield, Hon. Mark O., a U.S. Senator from the State of Oregon 55
Horn, William P., Assistant Secretary, Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, accompanied by William Penn Mott, Jr., Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior 64
Keune, Russell V., American Institute of Architects 170
Longsworth, Nellie L., president, Preservation Action 185
Maughan, Rex, chairman, Conference of National Park Concessioners 160
Mott, William Penn, Jr., Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior 74
Moynihan, Hon. Daniel P., a U.S. Senator from the State of New York 24
Pritchard, Paul C., president, National Parks and Conservation Association; accompanied by Laura Beatty 121
Reilly, William K., president, the Conservation Foundation, accompanied by Michael Mantell, senior associate, the Conservation Foundation 101
Schneider, Mike, on behalf of the T.L. Enterprises and the Good Sam Club 153
Sheffield, Hon. Bill, Governor, State of Alaska 36
Speser, Dr. Philip, Society for American Archaeology, accompanied by Kathleen Reinburg, director, office of public affairs, Society for American Archaeology 181
Wallop, Hon. Malcolm, a U.S. Senator from the State of Wyoming 1

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to additional committee questions 193

APPENDIX II

Additional material submitted for the record 214

ENTRANCE FEES AND RESOURCE PROTECTION FOR UNITS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1986

U.S. SENATE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, RESERVED WATER AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:33 a.m., in room SD-366, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Malcolm Wallop, presiding.

Present: Senators Wallop, Hatfield, Murkowski, Hecht, Bumpers, and Bingaman.

Also present: Tony Bevinetto, professional staff member; and Thomas B. Williams, professional staff member for the minority.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. MALCOLM WALLOP, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF WYOMING

Senator WALLOP. Good morning.

This morning the subcommittee will take up the important issue of entrance fees to units of the National Park System. We will hear testimony on two proposals to modify the current fee structure: S. 2204, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, to permit the use of park entrance admission, recreation and use fees for the operation of the National Park Service and for other purposes; and S. 2130, to preserve, protect, and revitalize the National Park System. I will place a copy of each of these measures in the hearing record.

[The texts of S. 2130 and S. 2204 follow:]

II

99TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 2130

To preserve, protect, and revitalize the National Park System.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

February 28 (legislative day, February 24), 1986

Mr. Durenberger (for himself, Mr. Chafee, Mr. Moynihan, Mr. Kasten, Mr. Baucus, and Mr. Hatfield) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

---

A BILL

To preserve, protect, and revitalize the National Park System.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986".

FINDINGS

Sec. 2. The Congress finds that--

(1) the National Park System was established to protect and preserve unique natural and cultural resources which constitute a major source of pride, inspi-

ration, and enjoyment for the people of the United States and which have gained international recognition and acclaim;

(2) increasing use of the parks and development within and outside of park boundaries have strained facilities and resources in the National Park System leading to resource deterioration and decline;

(3) between 1981 and 1985, Congress authorized the expenditure of nearly $1,000,000,000 by the National Park Service under the Park Restoration and Improvement Program to remedy serious health and safety problems associated with roads, sewers, visitor-use structures, and similar facilities within the national parks;

(4) the National Park Service has identified hundreds of pressing resource problems throughout the National Park System, and Congress has appropriated nearly $15,000,000 in fiscal year 1985 to address those problems of highest priority;

(5) despite this expenditure, National Park System resources continue to be degraded leaving future quality and survival in doubt;

(6) no comprehensive, long-term methodology now exists within the National Park Service—

(A) for detecting, measuring, and documenting resource problems;

(B) to set priorities for addressing such problems; or

(C) for assessing the success or failure of the National Park Service in responding to problems identified;

(7) the National Park Service lacks sufficient staff with adequate technical capabilities to manage and interpret the resources of the National Park System effectively, as well as the strong research and analytical capability necessary to anticipate and address future resource problems;

(8) in a system whose perceived core responsibility has been its natural areas, the commitment of the National Park Service to the management and protection of cultural resources needs continued strengthening; and

(9) unless a comprehensive, multiyear program is undertaken to—

(A) preserve and revitalize park natural and cultural resources;

(B) provide improved stewardship for future generations;

(C) address a growing backlog of deferred restoration and protection needs;

(D) involve the private sector more effectively in their protection; and

(E) institutionalize scientifically based resource management and resource interpretation as higher priorities within the National Park Service,

resource degradation will continue, and future remedial measures will become prohibitively costly.

PURPOSE AND POLICY

SEC. 3. (a) In furtherance of the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1–4), it is the purpose of this Act to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources within the National Park System for the benefit of present and future generations by establishing a comprehensive resources revitalization and protection program.

(b) The policy of the comprehensive resources revitalization and protection program shall be to—

(1) preserve, maintain, and revitalize natural and cultural resources;

(2) monitor and study the effects of park resource management policies and practices and human activity from within and outside the boundaries of National Park System units on natural and cultural resources;

(3) prepare resource management plans for each unit of the National Park System and biennial, system-

wide assessments on resource conditions and steps being taken to address the problems identified; and

(4) provide sufficient technical and scientific staffing and continuing education for effective resources management, interpretation and research.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior acting through the Director of the National Park Service;

(2) the term "resource" or "resources" includes both cultural and natural resources and means—

(A) in the case of natural resources, the geology, paleontological remains, and flora and fauna which are principally of indigenous origin; and

(B) in the case of cultural resources, the historic and prehistoric districts, sites, buildings, structures, objects, and human traditions associated with or representative of human activities and events, including related artifacts, records, and remains;

(3) the term "unit" means a unit of the National Park System; and

(4) the term "park" means a unit of the National Park System.

PRESERVATION AND REVITALIZATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall establish a comprehensive program to preserve and revitalize resources in the National Park System. The program shall be implemented as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d).

(b) The Secretary shall prepare resource management plans for each unit of the National Park System and shall update such plans at least every five years. The plans shall address both natural and cultural resources of the park units and shall include—

(1) a brief historical overview of the past composition, treatment, and condition of the resources of each park unit;

(2) a brief statement of the purposes and objectives for the management and preservation of the individual and collective components of the resource base;

(3) an inventory of significant resources and their current condition, prepared in accordance with acceptable scientific baseline data collection methods and as appropriate to support effective resource management decisionmaking;

(4) an identification of current and potential problems associated with the protection and management of the resources, including those in need of urgent stabili-

zation, repair and restoration, emanating from sources both inside and outside park unit boundaries;

(5) a comprehensive, detailed program of proposed actions to be taken to prevent or reverse the degradation of the natural and cultural resources of each park unit, including a proposed schedule of actions to be initiated and the estimated costs to complete such actions; and

(6) a brief summary of accomplishments in resolving resource problems identified pursuant to paragraphs (4) and (5) of this subsection.

(c) The Secretary shall develop criteria to establish priorities for addressing the resource problems identified in the resource management plans prepared pursuant to subsection (b). Such criteria shall include the following considerations—

(1) the existence of similar resource problems in other National Park System units;

(2) the severity of the problem and need for remedial action;

(3) the irreversibility of damages if no action is taken; and

(4) the feasibility of remedying the problem.

(d)(1) Based upon the following information contained in the resource management plans and on the criteria developed pursuant to subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(A) prepare a priority list of those cultural and natural resources within the National Park System units needing preservation and revitalization; and

(B) based on the priority list, devote such sums as are necessary to address a minimum of one hundred most critical natural and cultural resource problems each year, to a maximum of $12,000,000 per year.

(2) In making expenditures under paragraph (1), the Secretary may expend funds in affiliated areas of the National Park System where the expenditure of Federal funds is not prohibited by law.

MONITORING AND RESEARCH

SEC. 6. (a)(1) Based upon the information contained in resource management plans and on criteria developed pursuant to section 4(b), the Secretary shall—

(A) prepare a priority list of unit and systemwide monitoring and research needs; and

(B) based on the priority list, expend such sums as are necessary to address a minimum of the one hundred most critical natural and cultural resource research and monitoring projects each year, to a maximum of $12,000,000.

(2) In making expenditures under paragraph (1), the Secretary may expend funds in affiliated areas of the National Park System where the expenditure of Federal funds is not prohibited by law.

(b)(1) To improve monitoring and research capabilities systemwide, the National Park Service shall establish, where appropriate, model uniform methods of conducting baseline inventories and data collection based upon pilot programs in ten units of the National Park System, to be selected by the Secretary, which constitute a representative sampling of ecosystems and types of resources found in the system. To assist in the establishment of uniform model methods, research shall be undertaken where appropriate, such model methods shall be designed to produce data and other information necessary for effective resource management and protection within the various units of the National Park System.

(2) Within thirty-six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Park Service shall prepare and transmit a progress report to Congress summarizing—

(A) how the pilot programs established pursuant to paragraph (1) has worked;

(B) what it has accomplished; and

(C) whether it should be extended in place or to other units and under what circumstances.

(c) In addition to the other requirements of this section, the National Park Service shall take such further steps as are necessary to improve its ability to monitor resource conditions and enhance its knowledge of resource conditions, including—

(1) establishing within the agency an independent research capability for the purpose of investigating the resources of the national parks, including problems of management, protection, and interpretation of these resources.

(2) collecting and disseminating statistics, data, and other information on resource conditions, problems, and trends; and

(3) seeking additional scientific advisory assistance and advice on a contractual or noncontractual basis from Cooperative Park Service Study Units, Park Service research programs, the National Academy of Sciences, universities and colleges, nonprofit organizations, and other Federal, State and local agencies.

STAFFING AND TRAINING

SEC. 7. To ensure that an adequate number of trained personnel are available to manage and interpret National Park System resources, the Secretary shall—

(1) establish within twenty-four months after the date of the enactment of this Act, a national natural and cultural resources training center within the National Park Service to be located at the Horace M. Albright Training Center;

(2) provide a comprehensive training course for at least thirty-five prospective resource management specialists each year for a minimum of five years after the

date of enactment of this Act, and following each training course, place these specialists in permanent resource management positions within such units and offices of the National Park System as needed;

(3) institute programs of personal development and mandatory continuing education available annually for personnel involved in positions concerned with the condition of park resources, including superintendents, park managers, interpreters, rangers, and research scientists, as appropriate; and

(4) in addition to other requirements of this section, the National Park Service shall take such further steps as are necessary to strengthen the long-term scientific and technical capabilities of the agency.

RESOURCE CONDITION ASSESSMENT

SEC. 8. (a) In order to—

(1) more effectively establish systemwide resource management and protection priorities;

(2) better evaluate the responses by the National Park Service to the priorities established;

(3) facilitate congressional oversight; and

(4) better inform the public about the condition of park resources,

the Secretary shall prepare and transmit to Congress a biennial assessment of resource conditions, problems, possible remedial actions, and future needs for the National Park

System to be submitted to the Congress as part of the appropriation process.

(b) Based upon information contained in resource management plans as specified in section 4(a) of this Act and other information available to the Secretary, the assessment required by subsection (a) shall contain—

(1) documentation of the condition of park resources in each unit of the National Park System, including problems, policies, and practices relating to their degradation and possible solutions;

(2) an analysis of the effectiveness of measures taken to address the resource issues identified in each unit and those measures identified in systemwide policies and programs and the costs thereof;

(3) an analysis of future resource management needs and an estimate of the costs thereof; and

(4) an evaluation of the adequacy of current funding levels and legal authorities to address resource problems.

RESOURCE PROTECTION CHALLENGE GRANTS

SEC. 9. For the purpose of developing and fostering innovative partnerships between the National Park Service and not-for-profit organizations, universities and colleges, and State and local agencies to preserve, revitalize, monitor and study, and interpret park resources, the secretary shall make available the sum of $2,000,000 annually for grants, to be matched on a one-to-one basis with other funds or in-kind services. Highest priority in awarding such grants shall be given to preservation and revitalization projects and to research and monitoring projects.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1986, to the Department of the Interior $50,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act, and in each succeeding fiscal year until the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, the sum of $50,000,000.

AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965

SEC. 11. (a) Section 4 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 987; 16 U.S.C. 4601–6(a) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of subsection (a) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", except that any unit which provides significant outdoor recreation opportunities in an urban environment and to which access is publicly available at multiple locations may not be so designated.";

(2) in the first sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) by striking out "for a fee of not more than $10" and inserting in lieu thereof "for a fee of not more than $25";

(3) in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) by—

(A) striking out "(2) Reasonable" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), reasonable"; and

(B) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(B) No fee shall be charged on a day designated by the Secretary as a fee-free day. At least one fee-free day shall be designated each month of the year.";

(4) in the second sentence of paragraph (4) of subsection (a) by striking out "without charge" and inserting in lieu thereof "for a fee of $10";

(5) in the third sentence of paragraph (4) of subsection (a) by striking out "other";

(6) in subsection (a) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) The Secretary of the Interior shall establish procedures providing for the issuance of special permits for persons or groups undertaking educational or research activities in a unit if such persons or groups apply for such permit. Such procedures shall assure that each special permit shall be issued only to persons or groups to be determined by the Secretary to be involved in legitimate educational and research activities on a not-for-profit basis. Such permit shall be nontransferable, shall be issued without charge, and shall entitle the permittee or any person accompanying said permittee in a noncommercial vehicle or vehicles or other means, to entrance to any area designated pursuant to this subsection.'

(7) in subsection (e) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "When authorized by the head of the collecting agency, volunteers may sell permits and collect fees authorized or established pursuant to this section, and funds appropriated or otherwise available to the collecting agency shall be available to cover the cost of any surety bond as may be required of any such volunteer in performing such authorized services under this subsection."; and

(8) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking out "(f) Except" and inserting in lieu thereof "(f)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and except"; and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) For the period ending ten years from the date of enactment of this paragraph, all receipts collected from fees or permits for admission or entrance to the National Park System, and all fees collected under subsections (b) and (c) of this section with respect to the National Park System, shall be available without further appropriation, for expenditure under guidelines developed by the Secretary—

"(A) to defray the cost of collection;

"(B) for the purposes set forth in section 3 of this legislation within the collecting unit; and

"(C) for the purposes set forth in section 3 of this legislation within all units of the National Park System.".

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 402 of Public Law 96-87, relating to entrance fees to units of the National Park System, is amended by striking out "in excess of the amounts which were in effect as of January 1, 1979, or charge said fees at any unit of the National Park System where such fees were not in effect as of such date," and inserting in lieu thereof "in excess of $5,".

○

II

99TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 2204

To amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, to permit the use of park entrance, admission, and recreation use fees for the operation of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 18, 1986

Mr. McCLURE (by request) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

---

A BILL

To amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, to permit the use of park entrance, admission, and recreation use fees for the operation of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be referred to as the "National Park System Entrance Fee Act of 1986".

SEC. 2. Section 4(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l–6a(a)), is further amended as follows:

(1) The first sentence is amended by changing the period to a comma and inserting thereafter the following: "except that any unit which provides significant outdoor recreation opportunities in an urban environment and to which access is publicly available at multiple locations may not be so designated.".

(2) Paragraph (1) is amended by striking out "$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "$40" in the first sentence.

(3) Paragraph (1) is further amended by striking out "(1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1)(A)" and adding the following new subparagraph:

> "(B) For admission into a specific designated unit of the National Park System, or into several specific units located in a particular geographic area, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make available an annual admission permit for a reasonable fee. The permit shall convey the privileges of, and shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as, the Golden Eagle Passport, except that it shall be valid only for admission into the specific unit or units of the National Park System indicated at the time of purchase.".

(4) Paragraph (4) is amended by striking out "without charge" and inserting in lieu thereof "for a

fee of $10" in the second sentence, and by striking out "other" in the third sentence.

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l–6a), is further amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (e) is amended by adding the following after the final period: "When authorized by the head of the collecting agency, volunteers may sell permits and collect fees authorized or established pursuant to this section, and funds appropriated or otherwise available to the collecting agency shall be available to cover the cost of any surety bond as may be required of any such volunteer in performing such authorized services under this subsection.".

(2) Subsection (f) is amended by striking out "(f) Except" and inserting in lieu thereof "(f)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) and except"; and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the period ending ten years from the effective date of this paragraph, 80 per centum of all receipts collected from fees or permits for admission or entrance to the National Park System, and 80 per centum of all fees collected under subsections (b) and (c) of this section with respect to the National Park System, shall be available until expended, without further appropriation, for expenditure as determined by the Secretary, for operation of the National Park System. During such period 20 per centum of all such receipts and fees with respect to the National Park System shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.".

SEC. 4. Section 402 of the Act of October 12, 1979 (93 Stat. 664), is hereby repealed.

○

Senator **Wallop**. Let me begin by saying that I very much support the concept of increasing entrance fees to units of the National Park System. I must say that I say that with many caveats and I hope that one of the things that we can determine is a fee that is large enough so that the remainder of the activities inside the park that are not those controlled by concessions may be free. I do not think it is a good idea for us to charge so much for an interpretive tour and so much for a walk down a trail and so much for something else. It seems to me a better idea that the simplicity and the use of manpower of the National Park Service could be much more efficiently applied were we just charged a single basic entrance fee.

First, new revenues as well, generated by increased fees must be used to improve the system and not to balance the budget. Such funds must supplement the Federal appropriations, not replace them. Fee increases must be reasonable—I think there is reason to have dialog as to what constitutes reasonableness—to allow all citizens to enjoy our National Parks. Finally, fees must make sense, relative to the facilities provided and to the cost of collection.

The basic question we must address this morning is what is an equitable entrance fee structure for the National Park System? We must decide who will determine the fees for individual park units and how those receipts will be used. I hope, and it is my intent that this hearing provide us a forum for constructive exchange of ideas on these questions to guide as we consider these entrance fee pieces of legislation.

The hearing record will remain open for 2 weeks after today, during which time written testimony on either of these bills can be submitted to the subcommittee. In the interest of time, I am going to ask the witnesses to summarize their written statements in their oral testimony. Additional written comments may be provided and the entire testimony, oral and written, will be included in the record.

I would say to Assistant Secretary Horn that the hearing has been scheduled for quite some time. S. 2204 is the administration's major park initiative, and it would just seem that the Senate would have the testimony 24 hours in advance, given the length of time that it has been there.

I am tempted to cancel your appearance and have you come back tomorrow after members can review the statement. That is an awkward thing to do, and I guess won't. But it is really a nuisance. It is really basically inexcusable for us to have no opportunity to review the administration's own testimony on their own initiative when the hearing is not a surprise; it has been around for a while.

What I am going to have to do—and I say this with some apologies to my Senate colleagues—I have a special order which I must do, and he who was to come to replace me has not. I am going to recess until a Member of the Subcommittee or a Member of the Committee shows up. They will take it on, and we will start with Senator Durenberger.

There is a statement that Senator Moynihan will have. Governor Sheffield will have a statement for the record and Senator DeConcini has a statement for the record. I say this with apologies to both Senator Baucus and Senator Durenberger: If the requirements of Senate life require you somewhere else, we will have those statements inserted as if delivered, or I will be back as quickly as I possibly can, but I must recess the committee until such time as a member of the committee shows up.

[The prepared statements of Senator Moynihan, Senator DeConcini, and Governor Sheffield follow:]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN ON S. 2130, THE NATIONAL PARKS SYSTEM RESOURCE PRESERVATION AND REVITILIZATION ACT BEFORE THE SENATE PUBLIC LANDS SUBCOMMITTEE, JUNE 12, 1986

Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support the National Park System Resource Preservation and Revitilization Act of 1986, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation. This bill provides a rational investment in irreplaceable national resources -- resources which are enjoyed by an astounding number of Americans. A recent survey by the President's Commission on American Outdoors reported that more than 75 percent of all Americans use parks every year, and over 62 percent have visited at least one of our federal parks within the last five years. Over the past 25 years, total visits to the National Parks system have increased from 135 million visits to 350 million visits per year.

History of the National Parks

Congress laid the cornerstone of our national parks system in 1872 when it created Yellowstone Park from federal land which would later form Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming. In 1916, Congress passed an organic act which established the National Parks Service to oversee the National Parks. Aptly described by the first Park Service Director, Stephen Mather, the mission of the Service was to ensure that American's most wonderous natural resources were permentantly protected in our national parks "as close to how God made them as possible."

President Theodore Roosevelt, who added more than 148 million acres of national forest land to the public domain, and withdrew over 80 million acres of mineral lands from public sale, correctly observed that stewardship of our natural resources is an obligation we owe to future generations. In his message to Congress in December of 1907, he stated:

> To waste, to destroy, our natural resources, to skin and exhaust the land instead of using it so as to increase its usefulness, will result in undermining in the days of our children the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them amplified and developed.

In my state of New York, the Conservation Foundation has compiled a list of nine parks and 62 natural and cultural resource projects needing attention. Among those are 16 projects in the Fire Island National Seashore, and 14 projects in Gateway National Park, the nation's most heavily used park.

The sad truth is that Americans are loving our National Parks to death. A comprehensive report to Congress by the National Parks Service in 1980 on the "State of the Parks" chronicles a number of serious threats to the preservation and enjoyment of the parks. Our larger national parks (those greater than 30,000 acres) including Yellowstone, Yosemite, Great Smokey Mountain, Everglades, and Glacier, reported almost twice as many serious degredation problems as the smaller parks. Most of these great parks were once pristine areas surrounded by wilderness. Today, the buffer zones around these parks are disappearing, pollution is encroaching, and population pressures are increasing.

In more than 60 percent of our parks scenic resources are threatened. More than 45 percent of the parks suffer from air quality problems. And more than 40 percent of the parks showed evidence of threats to plant, mammal, and fresh water resources. The 1980 State of the Parks Report concludes, "It is clear that events are taking place that are causing demonstrable and severe damage to the natural and cultural resources of the nation national parks...."

Building on the 1980 State of the Parks Report, the Conservation Foundation recently completed a study which prescribes measures to address the parks' predicament. In "National Parks for a New Generation" the Conservation Foundation offers specific suggestions to turn the tide in our parks. S. 2130 incorporates many of those recommendations and addresses the problems cited by the National Parks Service in the 1980 State of the Parks Report.

Pressures on the parks' resource have increased dramatically, yet many of the parks have no resource management plan, and no baseline data. Without documentation of the condition of the resource base it is difficult or impossible for the Parks Service to identify the incremental changes caused by the intensive use and inevitable pollution increased visitation brings. Secretary Hodel has stated that visitation to the national parks will increase as much as 30 percent this summer alone.

We must act now to evaluate and stem the deterioration of our parks' resource base. The National Parks System Resource Preservation and Revitilization Act addresses the problems cited by the National Parks Service in the 1980 report and moves a long way toward their resolution.

How S. 2130 Addresses These Park Problems

The National Parks System Resource Preservation and Revitilization Act instructs the Secretary of Interior to prepare resource management plans for each unit of the National Park system with updates at least every five years. The plans will a) include an inventory of significant resources and their current condition, b) identify current and potential problems for protection and management, c) outline a detailed program to prevent and/or reduce degredation d) summarize accomplishments to this end in past years. The Secretary will also be required to develop criteria to establish a priority system to address those problems. Using those criteria, the Secretary will devote such sums as are necessary to address the 100 most pressing problems each year.

This legislation will also establish pilot programs in 10 units of the National Parks system to develop uniform methods of conducting baseline inventories; will train a minimum of 35 resource management specialists each year for at least 3 years; and will provide continuing education for present employees on relevant topics.

The Secretary will report back to the Congress on the progress of the efforts within 36 months of enactment, and will prepare a biennial assessment of resource conditions, problems, and remediation strategies. The biennial report will include an analysis of future needs and costs, and an evaluation of the adequacy of current funding levels and legal authorities to address resource problems. Finally, this legislation will make available $2 million per year in one-to-one challenge grants to universities and not-for-profit organizations for preservation and revitalization projects, research, and monitoring.

To pay for this, the Secretary will raise the fee base at those units of the National parks charging fees. This is a most reasonable plan. Currently visitation fees are capped at $2 per carload. This legislation would raise the cap to $5 per carload. Fees will be waived for educational and not-for-profit groups, and fee-free days will be established to allow all visitors to enter the parks fee of charge on designated days. The annual fee for the Golden Eagle pass, allowing unlimited use of the nations' parks, would be raised from $10 to $25, and the lifetime Golden Eagle pass for citizens over 62 years old would be available for a one-time fee of $10. Through the new fee structure, this legislation is expected to pay for itself.

This legislation will authorize $50 million for each of the next ten years, beginning October 1, 1986, effectively increasing the funding for resorce management from less than 12 percent of the National Park Service's total annual budget to about 17 percent.

Responding to the State of the Parks report, Secretary James Watt implemented a five year $1 billion program to refurbish the facilities within the parks. This program is now largely complete. It is high time that we addressed the problems of the resource base itself. If we do not act to protect that resource base today, we may not need the upgraded facilities tomorrow.

High Priority Natural and Cultural Resource Projects for Selected Parks Identified by National Park Service Regional Offices

NEW YORK

Source: National Park Service, May 1986

Compiled by
The Conservation Foundation
1255 Twenty-third Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

New York Natural and Cultural Resource Projects

Park	Project Title	Five-Year Total Funding ($1,000s)
Fire Island	Replant Native Vegetation	5
	Health Risk Lyme Disease	120
	Update Vegetation Map	10
	Survey Sensitive Species	30
	Wilderness Impact	52
	Deer Ecology	30
	Monitor Historic Vegetation	20
	Trace Elements in Soil/Vegetation	25
	Marsh Ecosystems Restoration	200
	Ecological Inventory	24
	Ecology, Sunken Forest	27
	Field Mgt. Plan	70
	Exotics Control	60
	Dune Preservation, OVR mgt.	59
	Monitor Water Quality	4
	Monitor Island Erosion	2
	Archeological Survey, Floyd Estate	165
	Conserve Contents, Floyd Estate	50
Fort Stanwix	Install Collection Storage System	50
Gateway (NJ, NY)	Map Vegetationn Inventory	70
	Fire Ecology Swamp White Oak	40
	Plankton Productivity	70
	N C Bridge Construction Monitoring	60
	Colon Waterbird Habitat Maintenance	80
	Soils Survey, Parkwide	60
	Sandy Hook Bay Erosion	15
	Butterfly/Wildflower Mgt.	25
	Landfill Leachates	382.5
	Restore Reptile/Amphibians	55
	Stabilize Battery Potter	55
	Prepare HABS DOC/Hanger Ros/J Riis Bathhouse	35
	Upgrade Collection Storage	60
	Prepare Administrative History	20
Martin Van Buren	Archeological Investigation	100
	Prepare Historic Resource Study	20
Sagamore Hill	Prepare Historic Grounds Study	20
	Preserve E.S. Curtis Collection	30
	Preserve & Reproduce Silk Bedspread	15
Saratoga	Natural Resource Mgt. Specialist	42
	Historic Vegetation Plan, Phase 2	14

	G I S Operation	23.3
	Forest/Vegetation Mgt.	90
	Deer Monitoring	15
	Water Quality Monitoring	9.8
	Develop IPM Plan	30
	G I S Set-up	12
	Vegetation Treatment: Fire Mgt.	20
	Historic Vegetation Plan, Phase 1	16
	Interaction Deer/Vegetation	54
	Prepare Archeology Study	25
	Prepare Archeological Study--British Fortification	38
	Prepare Administrative History	15
	Historic Resource Study: British Camp at Schuylerville	25
Upper Delaware	Landfill Effects Research	15
	Landfill Effects Monitoring	3
	River Recreation Research	50
	Water Quality Monitoring	5
	Impacts of Flow Rate Changes	80
Vanderbilt Mansion	Stabilize Coach House	25
	Analyze Mansion Interior Plaster Condition	10
Women's Rights	Prepare Historic Resource Study	505
	Landscape Stanton House Grounds	30

NEW YORK FIVE-YEAR FUNDING: Natural: $ 2,074,600
Cultural: 838,000

TOTAL: $ 2,912,600

Statement by Senator Dennis DeConcini
Park Service Entrance Fees
June 12, 1986

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to state my concerns on the Administration's proposal to increase entrance fees at units of the National Park system. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior and Related Agencies, I know only too well the problems that exist in our national parks due to insufficient funding levels. In my own State of Arizona, there are 13 plus units of the National Park system, including the Grand Canyon National Park, Canyon de Shelly, and Lake Mead National Recreation Area. All of these units, in one respect or another, have and will continue to experience budgetary shortfalls while on-the-ground needs are steadily increasing. Visitation and demands by the public have risen at our parks while Federal budgets have remained much too low. With the present budgetary crisis facing this country, we must look to alternative methods to fund resource management, maintenance, law enforcement, and personnel needs at our nation's parks.

I believe the citizens of this country will pay more to enjoy our nation's "crown jewels" if that money is to be used for the specific purpose of improving the condition of and services offered by the national parks they visit. But, the fees to be collected by the proposal initiated by the Administration, Mr.

Chairman, will not go back to the parks at which they are collected. On the contrary, the fees will be used to pay for the costs of fee collection and fund programs of the National Park Service which have been zeroed in other accounts. Let us not be fooled by the cries of this Administration which claims it is only trying to remedy some of the problems that exist at park units by the fee proposal. If the Reagan Administration is truly committed to recognizing existing resource problems and budgetary shortfalls, it would propose to increase fees to a fair level and use all of the funds collected to fund on-the-ground needs at these parks. That is not what is contained in the Administration's proposal as introduced by Chairman McClure. It is instead an initiative to reduce the Federal deficit through increased Park entrance fees by allocating a very small portion of the revenues collected to on-the-ground activities.

I have no philosophical difficulty with the idea of raising entrance fees if the increased revenues are sent back to units of the Park Service for the purpose of funding long-term resource and management needs of our parks. No one knows what impact increased fees will have on visitation to our parks. We can't estimate with any degree of accuracy whether or not increasing fees to a reasonable level will result in an additional $50 million or $100 million a year. Whatever we do, however, we should not impose fees that are much too high, discouraging visitation for those who cannot afford the costs. There has never been any scientific survey conducted to demonstrate what impact increases in fees will have on visitation to national parks. Our National Parks exist to be enjoyed by all of our nation's citizens -- they should not become sanctuaries for only those who can pay the price. To take a park like the Grand Canyon, which is one of the seven natural wonders of the world, and raise fees from the present $2 per car to $10 per car suddenly is unfair and unjustified. The experience of the Grand Canyon may be worth $10 per car -- but who are we make that kind of a judgment? Mr. Chairman, I would prefer to see this Congress take a courageous step to significantly increase budgets for the operation and maintenance of our national parks. The American public is being taxed to preserve these unique areas. Entrance fees can be perceived as just another form of tax. The only benefit is that those who chose to visit them, pay the most. We need an infusion of dollars into our parks. While I would quickly vote to support an overall budgetary increase, I recognize that this may not be realistic. Fees may be the only way to insure that the abundant resources housed in our national parks are properly protected. If that is how it must be, I firmly believe that a reasonable increase would be to double fees at the beginning. The Congress can always come back, if the fee proposal works as it is envisioned, and make additional increases later.

As I stated earlier, we have approximately 13 national park units in Arizona. We could easily use another $500 million on top of existing base budgets for those parks to bring them up to a standard that the public has a right to expect. We cannot and should not let these resources deteriorate further. We have to make some difficult sacrifices. Let us just make sure that the decisions we make help to resolve long-term needs. Let's not use these fees to reduce the deficit, fund other programs, or take the place of existing Federal budgetary resources.

BILL SHEFFIELD
GOVERNOR

STATE OF ALASKA
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
JUNEAU

June 11, 1986

The Honorable Malcolm Wallop
Chairman
Senate Subcommittee on Public
Lands, Reserved Water and
Resource Conservation
308 Dirksen Senate Office Bldg.
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing to present the views of the State of Alaska regarding S.2204 which is the subject of the Subcommittee's June 12 hearing. As you know, the proposed measure would raise the cost of Golden Eagle Passports and would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish similar permits for other units of the system.

According to Park Service personnel with whom we have spoken, S.2204 is not intended to cover National Parks in Alaska. Yet, because this intention is not clearly referenced, there is an ambiguity with respect to the application of S.2204 to Alaska. For reasons articulated during Congressional discussion of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), we believe that it would be poor public policy to include Alaska within the ambit of this legislation. Therefore, I respectfully request that the following language be inserted in the proposed legislation to clarify an important point which is apparently not in dispute: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, Section 203 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act shall remain in effect".

Thank you for considering the views of the State of Alaska.

Sincerely,

Bill Sheffield

Bill Sheffield
Governor

cc: Senator Ted Stevens
Senator Frank Murkowski
Congressman Don Young
Senator Dale Bumpers

[Recess taken.]

Senator **Hatfield** [presiding]. The hearing will come to order.

We are happy to have the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Durenberger, to offer testimony at this time. Senator, you may handle the testimony as you wish. Your entire statement will be placed in the record. You may highlight or summarize as you wish.

STATEMENT OF HON. DAVID F. DURENBERGER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Senator **Durenberger**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I expressed my appreciation to the subcommittee chairman also, who had to leave due to an order on the floor, for his sensitivity to the issues that we are going to be discussing today and for taking time to schedule and to hold this hearing so that we could focus congressional attention on the serious problems facing the National Park System.

As you well know, Mr. Chairman, increased visitor use this summer, further straining staff and resources in a tight budget environment begs a responsible policy response to the needs of the National Park System.

This administration has responded to a growing problem by proposing S. 2204, the National Park System Entrance Fee Act, which raises entrance fees and returns 80 percent of those fees to the National Park. Our colleague, Senator McClure, also has sought to address the problem in a timely way by offering an amendment to the Urgent Supplemental last week to raise entrance fees and return 100 percent of those fees to the parks.

Both proposals are a good starting point, but I would suggest we go beyond using entrance fees for basic operation and maintenance and reinvest these revenues in purposes for which the parks were established.

It has become increasingly clear that Congress must address the natural and cultural resource problems facing the National Park System. We have known since the 1970's, and really 1980, with the publication of the "State of the Parks Report" that our Park System is in trouble. Not only were scenic and cultural resources threatened but park facilities were deteriorating to the point where they needed to be, in some cases, destroyed.

Congress responded by spending $1 billion in 5 years to address facility-related problems. However, we have spent only a fraction on parks themselves, on the natural and the cultural resource problem and related management activities over that same period.

For example, in Yosemite, we spent $305,000 to replace lighting in tunnels, yet we spent only $132,000 on black bear management in the same period of time. The park has requested $231,000 for fiscal year 1987-91 for the Black Bear Program because current levels are not meeting their needs.

I have a list here, Mr. Chairman, of the cultural and natural resource projects in my own State which must be addressed, which relates to such things as stream bank erosion, vegetative problems, the stabilization, the preservation of artifacts, the historic structure preservation, the archeological evaluation, exotic plant monitoring, prairie monitoring, lake level regulation, water resource management, wolf management, fisheries, the bald eagle. I could go on and on and on with an illustrative list from a State which has only one National Park and some other related facilities such as wild and scenic rivers—two National Parks, but relatively small in size.

This list does not reflect wish lists of an individual superintendent. It reflects regional priorities. The Minnesota list alone is a $2 million list. I know that members of the subcommittee have similar lists prepared by the Conservation Foundation for projects in their States, and I imagine Minnesota's list pales in comparison to Wyoming, Arkansas, Washington, Alaska or New Jersey.

I think this gives the subcommittee a small idea of the magnitude of the problem that we are facing, because all of these projects will not get funded in this budget environment.

Last summer when we got together here for an oversight hearing on the condition of the national parks, I announced that I was preparing legislation to implement the Conservation Foundation's "Preservation 95" recommendation. S. 2130, the National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act is that legislation. It is a long-term—$50 million per year for 10 years—resource counterpart to the $1 billion 5-year park restoration and improvement project.

S. 2130 creates a four-part program designed to restore damage resources and provide protection against future damage; to increase monitoring and research; to alert the Service to emerging resource pressures and promote a timely response thereto; to require periodic systemwide reports on resource condition along the lines of the 1980 report; and to increase staffing and training in natural cultural resource management.

It also provides that entrance fees be targeted back to carry out the requirements of the act. Currently, as you know, Mr. Chairman, revenues from entrance fees are around $22 million a year. The provision in S. 2130 would raise an additional $23 million. Targeting these revenues back establishes a trust fund of sorts which provides added protection against Gramm-Rudman-Hollings cuts into user-fee-financed park systems.

Finally, these revenues are to supplement, not to offset regular appropriations.

I would take just a moment of the subcommittee's time to point out the differences between my fee provision and that of the administration and Senator McClure. The administration would raise fees up to $10 per unit, but there is no statutory cap on that amount; 20 percent, $15 million of those fees, would be used to retire the Federal debt, leaving 80 percent, or $59 million, to cover basic park operations.

Senator McClure has improved on that by capping fees at $7.50, returning 100 percent of the revenues to the Park Service and providing that a minimum of 50 percent of whatever is collected in a particular park is retained at the collecting park.

S. 2130 goes a step further. It caps fees at $5, returns 100 percent to the Park Service to address cultural and natural resource problems.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know, a vacation to our national parks for $5, $7.50, or $10, is a bargain and I am convinced that the

American public will be willing to pay a little extra if they know their money will be returned to the park system.

But I am also convinced, and I hope members of the subcommittee will be, too, by the end of today's hearing that Congress must take action to address the serious resource problem facing these valuable national parks in order to protect and to conserve them for the enjoyment and the use of present and future generations.

I look forward, Mr. Chairman, to working with you and members of this subcommittee and my good friend from Nevada, Mr. Hecht, and all the members of the full committee toward that end.

[The prepared statement of Senator Durenberger follows:]

Senator Dave Durenberger

U.S. Senator for Minnesota

STATEMENT BY
SENATOR DAVE DURENBERGER
ON S.2130 AND S.~~2044~~ 2204
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND RESERVED WATER
JUNE 12, 1986

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your leadership in holding this hearing this morning, and focusing Congressional attention on the serious problems facing the National Park Service.

As you well know, Mr. Chairman, increased visitor use this summer, further straining staff and resources in a tight budget environment, begs for a responsible policy response.

The Administration has responded to this growing problem by proposing S. 2204, the National Park System Entrance Fee Act, which raises entrance fees and returns 80% of those fees to the parks. Senator McClure, also has sought to address this problem in a timely way by offering an amendment to the Urgent Supplemental to raise entrance fees and returns 100% of the fees to the Parks.

Both proposals are good starting points. But I suggest we go beyond using entrance fees for basic operation and maintenance and reinvest these revenues for the resources for which the parks were established.

It has become increasingly clear that Congress must address the natural and cultural resource problems facing the National Park System. We have known since 1980, with the publication of the "State of Parks Report," that our parks were in trouble. Not only were scenic and cultural resources threatened, but park facilities were deteriorating. Congress responded by spending $1 billion in five short years to address facility related problems. We've only spent a fraction on natural and cultural resource problems and management activities.

For example, in Yosemite National Park we spent $305,000 to replace lighting in tunnels, yet only spent $132,000 over the same period for black bear management. The Park has requested $231,000 for FY87-91 for this program because current levels are not meeting the needs.

I have a list here, Mr. Chairman, of the cultural and natural resource projects in Minnesota which must be addressed. This list does not reflect the wish lists of the individual Superintendents, but rather reflects regional priorities. It is a nearly $2 million list. I know that members of this Subcommittee have similar lists (prepared by the Conservation Foundation based on Park Service surveys of regional offices) for projects in their states, and I imagine Minnesota's list pales in comparison to Wyoming, Arkansas, Washington, Alaska or New Jersey's. I think this gives the Subcommittee a little idea of the magnitude of the problem we are facing, as all of these projects will not get funded in this budget environment.

Last summer we got together in this room for an oversight hearing on the condition of the parks and to review the Conservation Foundation's report, "National Parks for a New Generation." The Conservation Foundation's bottom line was that we must take action now to mitigate threats to park resources or we risk losing the resources for which the parks were created and they will be lost to future generations.

I announced last summer that I was preparing legislation in response to the Foundation's "Preservation '95" recommendation. S.2130, "The National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act" is that legislation. It is a long term -- $50 million per year for ten years -- resource counterpart to the $1 billion Park Restoration and Improvement Project. S. 2130 is a four part program designed to institutionalize resource management and protection as a higher priority within the National Park Service.

First, this legislation requires the National Park Service to prepare resource management plans for each unit of the National Park System and update them at least every five years. Although the Park Service currently requires resource management plans to be prepared for each unit, these plans often vary in quality and are often based on fragmentary information. They may not adequately identify potential resource problems, nor detail steps already being taken or needed to remedy them.

Specifically, the resource management plans are to include an inventory of significant resources, identification of current or potential resource management problems, current and proposed responses to problems identified, and strides made toward resolving them. The Secretary of Interior is also directed to establish criteria to determine priorities in resolving the resource problems identified with the plans. The one-hundred most critical problems identified through this process will be addressed each year to a maximum of $12 million.

Second, based on these plans the Secretary is directed to identify and undertake the one-hundred most critical research and monitoring projects to a maximum of $12 million per year. In addition, the Service is instructed to establish more uniform methods of collecting information in a way that can be utilized by resource managers. At the present time, the Park Service does not know if particular resources are under stress, and if there are visible signs, what they are and what the causes might be. This section also authorizes a pilot program to be followed by a report to Congress before any system-wide methodology is implemented.

Third, S.2130 establishes a permanent resource management training center and directs a continuing education program in resource management. Despite recent attempts to train additional personnel, there is a serious shortage of trained resource managers and interpreters within the National Park Service. Furthermore, continuing training requirements for other personnel, such as rangers, focuses far more heavily on law enforcement and visitor services than on resource protection and management.

Fourth, the Secretary is required to prepare a biennial, system-wide assessment of park resources that documents their condition, analyzes possible remedial measures and the costs thereof, and the adequacy of funding and legal authority to address problems identified. This report would be submitted to Congress to enable it to more effectively exercise oversight authority, to better inform the public of resource conditions, and to enable the Service to better establish priorities for addressing problems.

Finally, in order to assure that funding will be available to carry out the activities of the bill, I have included language which would allow the Park Service to raise entrance fees from $2 to no more than $5, raise the "Golden Eagle" yearly pass from $10 to $25, and charge a one time fee of $10 for the "Golden Age Passport." Educational groups would be exempted from the entrance fees and one free day per month would be established.

Currently, revenues from entrance fees are around $22 million per year. This provision would raise an additional $23 million a year for a total of $45 million which would be targeted back to the Park Service to carry out the requirements of this Act. Targeting revenues back establishes a trust fund of sorts which provides added protection against Gramm-Rudman-Hollings cuts. These revenues are to supplement, not offset regular appropriations.

I want to take just a moment of the Subcommittee's time to point out the differences between my fee provision and that of the Administration and that of Senator McClure.

The Administration would raise fees up to $10 per unit, but there is no statutory cap on that amount, 20% -- $15 million -- of those fees would be used to retire the Federal debt, leaving 80% -- $59 million -- to cover basic park operations.

Senator McClure improved upon that by capping fees at $7.50, returning 100% of the revenues to the Park Service and providing that a minimum of 50% of whatever is collected is retained at the collecting park.

S. 2130 caps fees at $5 and returns 100% to the Park Service to address cultural and natural resource problems.

Mr. Chairman, a vacation to our national parks for $5, $7.50 or $10 is a bargain, and I am convinced that the American public will be willing to pay a little extra if they know their money will be returned to the park.

But I am also convinced, and I hope members of this Subcommittee will be too by the end of today's hearing, that Congress must take action to address the serious resource problems of our valuable national parks in order to protect and conserve them for the enjoyment and use of present and future generations.

I look forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman, and other members of the Subcommittee toward that end.

Thank you.

Minnesota Natural and Cultural Resource Projects

Park	Project Title	Five-Year Total Funding ($1,000s)
Grand Portage	Vegetative Comparison Study	2
	Streambank Erosion Mgt.	40
	Stabilize/Preserve Artifacts	178
	Historic Structures Preservation Guide	20
	Historic Grounds Study & Landscape Plan	35
Pipestone	Prairie Monitoring	5
	Exotic Plant Monitoring	10
	Archeological Survey & Evaluation	12
St. Croix (MN, WI)	Salvage & Preserve Cultural Resources	125
Voyageurs	Regulated Lake Level Mgt.	328
	Water Resources Mgt.	312
	Wolf Mgt.	20
	Campsite/Picnic Site Mgt.	60
	Fisheries Mgt.	35
	Bald Eagle/Osprey Mgt.	65
	Declining Native Wildlife	233
	Replace Five Unsafe Water Supply Systems	40
	Upgrade Collection Storage	21
	Archeological Base Line Inventory	60
	Historic Sites Inventory, Archeological History	120
	Stabilize Eroding Archeological Sites	40

MINNESOTA FIVE-YEAR FUNDING: Natural: $ 1,110,000
Cultural: 666,000

TOTAL: $ 1,776,000

Senator **Hatfield**. Thank you, Senator, for your excellent testimony. You indeed have a very important park in your State.

Years ago, I was involved in some land exchange between Boise Cascade and the park program there at Boise Park, so I am somewhat familiar with that. So you have been very helpful in the testimony you have offered to expedite this legislation. I hope you will stay close to the process so that as we move on to markup and reporting of the bill, that you will be an active participant throughout.

Senator **Durenberger**. Mr. Chairman, I would just add one personal dimension. That is, that I am not here just representing my State or the interests of my State.

I spent about 6 or 7 years before I came to the Senate as an unpaid pro bono chairman of one of the country's largest regional park preserve systems, as chairman of the board. Our job was, in a 2½-million-person metropolitan area, to preserve certain areas of open space; some of the prairies, the big woods, some of the Canadian geese that were leaving that area and a variety of other forms of wildlife, and to restore it to its natural condition.

That is why S. 2130, from that background, is pointed in the direction of the natural and the cultural resource preservation, even using the park fees. It is not just to fancy up the roads and put up the lights and get out the flags. It's to do something about the resource itself.

Senator **Hatfield**. And the funding will have to occur in addition to general operation and maintenance that we are committed to at the moment, which is totally inadequate. So we are going to be looking at not only policy and guidelines, but we are going to have to be looking at significant initial funding.

Senator **Hatfield**. Thank you, Senator.

I am happy to welcome Senator Max Baucus of Montana for his statement. Senator Baucus, we will include your entire statement in the record and you may proceed to highlight it or summarize as you wish.

STATEMENT OF HON. MAX BAUCUS, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MONTANA

Senator **Baucus**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will submit my entire statement for the record.

Mr. Chairman, I think you know as well as all of us that the deterioration of our National Park System is a ticking time bomb. We know the visitor pressures, the people pressures, the population pressures on our Park System; we know the physical deterioration of our Park System. We know that there is inadequate attention to resource development, to research in making our parks what they should be. There is inadequate attention to that. We all know what the problems are.

As you well know, Mr. Chairman, there was a 1980 report which documented about 4,300 threats to our National Park System and 75 percent of those are inadequately documented or not being addressed at all. The vast bulk are not being addressed at all. There are threats like acid rain, ground water contamination, other environmental biological threats to the wildlife in the parks, as well as to the biota in the parks. It is a major problem that we all face.

We all well know, too, that so far the fees that the visitors pay to the parks goes to the general fund. Those fees do not go directly to the Park Service. The fact is that of the funds that have been spent on the Park Service, the vast bulk of that goes to visitor centers and the buildings. It does not go to resource development to maintain the wildlife in the parks. It does not go into research for enhancing the value of the parks.

We well know that people go to parks not to see buildings. There are enough buildings around in this country. They do not go to see tunnels, although, obviously, adequate facilities and adequate tunnels are necessary. Americans and foreigners go to our parks, visit our parks, for other reasons. They want to enjoy the outdoors experience and they want to see the wildlife, with the bears, for example, that Senator Durenberger referred to.

It is apparent to all of us, and it is imperative, too, to all of us that the amount of resources and the funds dedicated to the Park Service be increased, but also the allocation be changed, that the allocation be more devoted to the resource development than has been the case in the past.

That has not happened in the past because it is easier to spend time and money on buildings. It is more difficult to know how to manage the natural resources. Nevertheless, the effort obviously has to be made.

I am a cosponsor to the bill that Senator Durenberger has introduced and I do so because I think it addresses the problems that most of us know are there. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, too, that some of the best ambassadors of our National Park System are the visitors who go there. They want to enjoy a good experience and they are happy when the experience is good and they are good advocates of a strong National Park System.

I think visitors are willing to pay more in fees, so long as they know that those increased fees go directly to the park and resource development within the parks. I think visitors who go to parks do not want their money to go to the general fund. They do not want their fees to go down the rathole, to spend money on wasteful Federal spending, to spend money on MX missiles, spend money on any other Federal program. They want those funds, those increased fees, to go directly to the Park Service.

If we do that, I think you will get very, very strong public support, strong national support for increased fees, again so long as those fees are dedicated to the park.

Mr. Chairman, as you well know, the administration also suggests increased fees, but the administration would like 20 percent of those fees to go to the general fund. That would be a major mistake in my judgment. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the American public does not want that. They will pay higher fees, up to $5, for example, so long as those fees are dedicated to the park and I think so long as a much greater proportion of the effort is devoted to resource development.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would conclude my formal remarks and I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

[The prepared statement of Senator Baucus follows:]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MAX BAUCUS

ENERGY SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

JUNE 12, 1986

MR. CHAIRMAN, I WANT TO COMMEND YOU FOR HOLDING THIS IMPORTANT HEARING.

PROPER MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION OF OUR COUNTRY'S CULTURAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES NEEDS TO BE THE HIGHEST PRIORITY OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.

UNFORTUNATELY, THIS HAS NOT BEEN THE CASE.

THE PARK SERVICE HAS PUT MORE EMPHASIS ON EXPANDING AND IMPROVING THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES IN NATIONAL PARKS THAN ON SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.

LAST YEAR, ABOUT 51 PERCENT OF THE PARK SERVICE'S BUDGET WENT TOWARD PHYSICAL PLANT AND VISITOR FACILITY IMPROVEMENTS. AT THE SAME TIME, ONLY 16 PERCENT OF THE BUDGET WENT FOR MANAGEMENT OF THE PARK RESOURCES THAT THE VISITORS CAME TO SEE.

BUDGETS GO HAND IN GLOVE WITH POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS. AND THAT'S WHAT THIS PARK USER FEE ISSUE IS ALL ABOUT.

INCREASING THE ENTRANCE FEES FOR OUR NATIONAL PARKS, MONUMENTS, AND OTHER UNITS IN THE PARK SYSTEM WILL RAISE A GOOD AMOUNT OF MONEY.

THE MAIN QUESTION IS: WHAT DO WE DO WITH THIS MONEY?

ADMINISTRATION'S FEE PROPOSAL

THE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL TO INCREASE ENTRANCE FEES TO NATIONAL PARKS AND OTHER UNITS IN THE PARK SYSTEM IS SERIOUSLY FLAWED.

UNDER THIS PLAN, 20 PERCENT OF THE REVENUES COLLECTED WOULD BE RETURNED TO THE U.S. TREASURY. THE REMAINING 80 PERCENT WOULD BE DISTRIBUTED, AT

THE DISCRETION OF THE SECRETARY, FOR USE BY UNITS OF THE PARK SYSTEM.

THIS IS NOT A WISE WAY TO SPEND PARK SERVICE MONEY.

FEES PAID BY USERS OF THE PARK SHOULD GO BACK TO THE PARK TO IMPROVE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.

MONTANAN'S VIEWS

MONTANANS MADE THIS POINT CLEAR RECENTLY AT A STATEWIDE FORUM CONDUCTED BY GOVERNOR TED SCHWINDEN.

GOVERNOR SCHWINDEN FOUND WIDESPREAD SUPPORT FOR FAIR AND EQUITABLE RECREATIONAL USER FEES TO INVEST IN PROGRAMS TO IMPROVE THE LAND.

HOWEVER, MONTANANS WERE STRONGLY OPPOSED TO RECREATIONAL USER FEES TO HELP REDUCE THE NATIONAL DEBT AND PAY FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE AND OTHER GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES.

But that's the direction the Administration's propasal is heading.

It seems the Administration is pushing these user fees as a way to fund the Park Service in lieu of budget appropriations.

This is nothing more than a back-handed attempt at budget-cutting.

BAUCUS PROPOSAL

Mr. Chairman, there is a much better approach.

I am a cosponsor of S. 2130, which would increase park fees but, at the same time, address the need to support resource management.

The fees collected under this bill, 100 percent of them, would be invested in resource management programs in national parks.

The bill outlines a five-point program for improving park resource management.

FIRST, EACH UNIT OF THE PARK SERVICE WOULD BE REQUIRED TO DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.

THE PLANS, UPDATED EVERY FIVE YEARS, WOULD INCLUDE AN INVENTORY OF PARK RESOURCES AND A LIST OF PROBLEM AREAS ALONG WITH PROPOSED SOLUTIONS, COSTS AND TIMETABLES FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION.

THE FOREST SERVICE AND BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ALREADY ARE REQUIRED TO DRAW UP SUCH PLANS.

SECOND, THE PARK SERVICE WOULD ESTABLISH AN INDEPENDENT RESEARCH UNIT AND SET UP 10 PILOT RESROUCE MONITORING PROGRAMS WITHIN THE SYSTEM.

THE FOREST SERVICE HAS A SIMILAR PROGRAM SET UP.

THIRD, THE PARK SERVICE WOULD BE REQUIRED TO PREPARED A BIENNIAL REPORT FOR CONGRESS ON THE CONDITION OF THE NATIONAL PARKS AND ON PROBLEMS THREATENING THE PARKS.

AGAIN, CONGRESS HAS ALREADY REQUIRED THE FOREST SERVICE TO CONDUCT SUCH PERIODIC REVIEWS.

FOURTH, THE PARK SERVICE WOULD BE REQUIRED TO PROVIDE NEW TRAINING PROGRAMS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT FOR PARK RANGERS.

OF THE 14,000 FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT PARK SERVICE EMPLOYEES, ONLY ABOUT 200 ARE NATURAL RESROUCE MANAGEMENT SPECIALISTS, AMOUNTING TO LESS THAN 1 1/2 PERCENT OF THEIR WORK FORCE.

BY COMPARISON, THE FOREST SERVICE HAS NEARLY 7,5000 NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT SPECIALISTS, REPRESENTING OVER 20 PERCENT OF ITS WORKFORCE.

FINALLY, THIS BILL WOULD AUTHORIZE THE PARK SERVICE TO SPEND UP TO $2 MILLION PER YEAR FOR MATCHING GRANTS TO UNIVERSITIES AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS, TO ENCOURAGE THE STUDY AND MONITORING OF PARK RESOURCES.

THIS LEGISLATION IS A POSITIVE STEP TOWARD PROVIDING THE PARK SERVICE WITH THE BASIC TOOLS TO

UNDERSTAND AND ADDRESS ITS PROBLEMS IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT.

AN INCREASE IN THE PARK FEES MUST BE CAREFULLY TAILORED TO ENSURE THAT THE REVENUE IS USED WHERE IT IS NEEDED THE MOST -- IN OUR NATIONAL PARKS.

I LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH THIS COMMITTEE TO COME UP WITH A FEE PROPOSAL THAT WILL BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF OUR COUNTRY'S CULTURAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES.

THANK YOU.

Senator **Wallop** [presiding]. Thank you. I would like to turn first to Senator Hatfield with my thanks to him for picking up the Chair for those few minutes that I was gone.

Mr. **Hatfield**. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to fill in for a few moments here. I would only like to say to the Senator who raises a question here about funding, this legislation is vital to get a unified policy because I would only like to say for the record that the Appropriations Committee, which I happen to chair, has imposed upon administrative requests, additional moneys over and above what had been requested in their annual budgets.

The Appropriations Committee has been, I think, far more alert to these growing needs, but there are certain limits to which we can increase funding against adminstration requests or against administration views and proposals. But I just want to make for the record that we have appropriated consistently more money than the administration has requested. Not only this administration, but previous administrations. This is a long-time neglect. It is not just something that has happened within the last few years.

I believe I can date back to 1972 and that goes through Democratic as well as Republican Presidents, where the Appropriations Committee has constantly appropriated higher levels of funding for park programs, park rehabilitation, but what we have lacked is a long-term master plan which this bill will provide and put further leverage on executive administrations which are less than responsive or which do not have as high priority.

So I just want to make that as part of the record this morning and I appreciate your bringing that point into your testimony.

Senator **Baucus**. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to emphasize that I hope we do not engage in backdoor deficit reduction by dedicating some of the increased user fees to a general treasury. I think it is imperative that the fees go to the park.

Senator **Wallop**. I thank you very much.

Mr. Hatfield, do you have a statement?

STATEMENT OF HON. MARK O. HATFIELD, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

Senator **Hatfield**. Mr. Chairman, I do have a statement I would like to place in the record. Let me just very briefly at this point highlight it.

Do you wish for me to take the table? Do you wish me to go down there?

Senator **Wallop**. No; I think since you are a member of the committee the reporter can catch you. They can see something of your face instead of the back of your head.

Senator **Hatfield**. Mr. Chairman, this most unusual system that has been created was created in 1916 and has come to be the envy of the world as far as the uniqueness of a national park resource system.

It has always been under certain pressure. I am sure there has never been a time when those who have expertise would feel that we were really caught up with the requirements of managing and monitoring such an extensive system, but I do believe that there are those cycles in which, if you look at the history of the national parks, we will find there are certain times when the pressures are of extreme significance that call for a very dramatic and very important leadership and change of policy.

I think we are in that situation at the moment, because if you look at the overall park program as well as the individual units that make up that park program, we are really in a losing battle in not only the maintenance and the operation of the general programs but especially in some areas where we have been negligent and really have not addressed certain points and certain issues over the history of this park system.

This is not just an opinion, but one can go to the very careful surveys that have been made in studies, and they have been numerous. Like too many studies that we make in the federal system, we make a study and then we put it in a file drawer, rather than to implement the findings of such studies.

Take the visitor program alone and the kind of statistics that have come out of that study. We know that it has grown astronomically, particularly in the last 25 years. In 1986 it is expected, because of the lower gasoline prices, because of the increased percentage of the income of families, about a 7-percent increase that will be spent this year on vacations over last year, the growing concerns of terrorism, of travel abroad, it is estimated there will be a 30 percent increase this year alone over last year in visitor demands in our park and the usage of our parks.

Now, we also have another survey that was made a few years ago in 1980 called the "State of the Parks Report." And in this particular report, they point out that natural resources in the parks were in grave danger as they had been, but then it broke that down into some very interesting statistics that the scenic resources were in trouble in 60 percent of our national parks. Now, that is just something to look at, so to speak. That is not something other than visual.

But that is because of land developments that have occurred around the parks, the problems that relate to forest disease, the forests within the parks. It relates to mining activities that have occurred. So you have a lot of causes or reasons.

Then we have the animal and the plant and the fresh water resources who are threatened in 40 percent of the parks. There again, that is due to visitor use, it is due to erosion, it is due to pollution, for many reasons. I think the most distressing part of the report was that it indicated that 75 percent of the reported threats were inadequately understood or documented. In other words, the major part of our problem is we do not even have an inventory or a careful identification of those, and yet there is the evidence on all hands of this deterioration.

We find this even in a park like Crater Lake, OR, which is our only national park, and you think, well, a lake is a lake, and how can that particular lake situation deteriorate? Well, we find that the clarity of the lake has deteriorated and we do not know why. We do not have any pollution that is visual or that is noticeable in terms of we are not dumping anything into the lake; we are not creating that; there is no industry around the lake of significance. Yet, the clarity of that water has been changing.

So, consequently, that is one of the unidentified problems that we need to identify, and only typical of perhaps too many of our parks.

We had another study in 1982 and this study indicated that we had a great threat to the cultural resources found in our parks, artifacts and historic things of that kind. Landmark buildings, archeological sites were deteriorating because of overuse and exposure to the environment. We have had problems of vandalism, and renovations have been undertaken in some cases without an adequate plan as far as historic monuments are concerned, without proper guidance and study.

The General Accounting Office also made another study and that undertaken at the time documented serious visitor health problems, safety problems due to deterioration of the facility, such as roads and sewer systems and bridges.

A few years ago I remember we had 20 or 30 illnesses that came out at Crater Lake because the sewer line had crossed over into a water line that had polluted the water and visitors to the park were stricken with food poisoning or intestinal disorder. We had a public hearing out there because of this particular thing.

Now, that very, very common type of problem we face in the deterioration of such facilities that relate to visitors' health.

Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize, too, that Congress, I think, has been in the leadership role here. We appropriated $1 billion in responding to this problem over a 5-year period to correct deficiencies in lodges, in drinking water systems, sewage treatment plants, and other infrastructures handling the National Park Restoration Improvement Program.

Unfortunately, this program has done little to address the problems facing the natural and the cultural resources. In other words, these are kind of catchup, sort of a short term. We now need this kind of legislation that this bill embodies, I think, for the long-term planning.

I think that it is not surprising that despite some advances in this area, some badly needed resource protection, remedial efforts, have lost out in competition with other park needs.

In the final analysis, we have spent a fairly small amount of money. Although 175 serious problems were identified by the Park Service in 1984, only 61 of them could be addressed through funding and remedial action. In Oregon alone, again with only one national park, we have over $2 million worth of projects that have been identified, and very few of those have been undertaken. I will not list all of our specifics there, but I would like to say that it seems to me that this legislation does have a price tag, it has a cost factor. Let's not kid ourselves. We can play games with Gramm-Rudman and other such charades, but we still have to face the reality that this legislation is not going to solve the problem by merely putting it on the statute books unless we are willing to take the bold action to fund it.

I want to assure this committee that from my position on the Appropriations Committee, I will give every bit of effort I can, and energy, to fund such a program once this is enacted. But I do want to bring that point to bear here, that we can't play games by telling the public we are going to solve the problems by enacting authorizing legislation if we are not willing to give the same backing, same support, to the funding and the implementation of the act.

That is the height of hypocrisy to put some kind of a grand plan on the statute books and then not fund it. We have too much evidence of that type of thing happening every day in the Congress.

So I think that it is the kind of funding that will require long-term commitment. We cannot get excited one year and then forget it the next year. We can't get aroused and then forget about the carrythrough. It has got to be one of those things that we are committed to, to a full period of action and then gestation and then birth.

I think that this program makes sense even if we were not in a time of budget deficits and particularly when it does include modest increases in visitor and user fees. What is the real heart of this proposal to me, is it does address the funding problem.

So I think it is time to act. We may not have time if we wait and the costs will be higher. It is cost-effective to act early rather than late and I think it is the duty of the Federal Government in the matter of being good stewards of these lands to act and to be the kind of leader and steward that the original founders of the National Park System envisioned and I think the people have basically supported.

I want to be a strong supporter, Mr. Chairman, and support you in this effort and I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for putting high priority on this hearing.

[The prepared statement of Senator Hatfield follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. MARK O. HATFIELD, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to be heard today in support of S. 2130, the National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986. Our National Park System is without a doubt the most unique and magnificent network of recreation facilities in the world. Unfortunately, due to age, neglect, a lack of funds, and other factors, many of the National parks' natural and cultural resources currently are in neeed of rehabilitation and enhancement activities. These actions are necessary to ensure that they retain their natural beauty and remain accessible to the public. I believe S. 2130 is important legislation which will help preserve our National Parks so that future generations may enjoy these magnificent places as we do today.

The National Park System was created in 1916 to protect some of the world's great scenic, natural, and cultural wonders. It is a great American success story that has stood the test of time. However, times have changed and pressures on the resources of the parks have increased dramatically. The National Parks today are waging a losing battle to provide quality recreational experiences to its visitors in the midst of both huge increases in usage, and ambitious development activities on land around park boundaries. For example, the number of park visitors has grown astronomically since 1960. In 1986 alone, the Department of the Interior predicts a 30 percent increase in park usage due in part to low gasoline prices and the threat of terrorism abroad. There is some question whether the parks will be able to deal adequately with this large influx.

While the National Park Service has never been free from pressures, new and more serious problems have come to light in recent years. In its 1980 State of the Parks Report, the Park Service concluded that natural resources in the parks were in grave danger. The report indicated that scenic resources were in trouble in 60 percent of the parks due to land development, mining, and forest diseases. Animal, plant, and freshwater resources were threatened in 40 percent of the parks due to visitor use, erosion, air pollution, and the like. Perhaps most distressing was the estimation that 75 percent of the reported threats were inadequately understood or documented. This finding relates directly to the magnificant Crater Lake National Park in my home State of Oregon. While we know that the wonderous clarity of

Crater Lake has declined markedly, we simply do not know why or how to restore it to its former state.

A 1982 study dealing with threats to cultural resources found a similar situation: Landmark buildings and archaeological sites deteriorating from overuse and exposure to the environment, serious losses due to vandalism, and renovations undertaken on important historic monuments without proper guidance or study. Furthermore, a General Accounting Office study undertaken at the same time documented serious visitor health and safety problems due to deteriorating park facilities, such as roads, sewer systems and bridges.

Congress has responded to these growing concerns by appropriating $1 billion over a five year period to correct deficiencies in lodges, drinking water systems, sewage treatment plants, and other infrastructure under the Park Restoration and Improvement Program. Unfortunately, this program has done little to address the problems facing the natural and cultural resources that are threatened. Perhaps this is understandable. To the visitor awed by the clarity of Crater Lake, for example, the park defender who warns that clarity has declined can seem to be carping about what is wrong with resources that are obviously wonderful. So it is not surprising that, despite some advances in this area, some badly needed resource protection and remedial efforts have lost out in competition with other park needs.

In the final analysis, we have spent a comparatively small sum on resource problems. Although 175 serious problems were identified by the Park Service in 1984, only 61 could be funded for research or remedial action. Many more have not been attended to. In Oregon alone, over $2 million worth of projects have been identified but only a few undertaken. Projects identified as needing urgent attention include those involving repairing riparian habitat and preventing streambed erosion in John Day Fossile Beds National Monument; conducting a cave inventory at Oregon Caves; and monitoring air quality and improving management of the majestic caldera at Crater Lake National Park. Over 40 natural and cultural resource projects in need of immediate attention have been identified in Oregon National Park System units alone, and these will not be addressed in the time frame and manner needed, unless Congress acts by passing S. 2130 this year.

Those natural and cultural resource projects already underway throughout the Parks system are geared only to deal with existing problems. Little is being done to plan for the long-term. The lack of trained personnel has meant that the parks have been unable to recognize and assess problems, let alone undertake remedial measures.

While this legislation is not without cost, funding would be half that of the Parks Restoration and Improvement Program, and would be spread out over twice the time. It is a wise long-term investment, modest in terms of the needs, and ultimately will save money. Importantly, these funds would supplement, not replace, the basic funding for existing resource management and interpretive programs which currently constitute a relatively small part of the Park System's annual budget.

This program makes sense even in a time of unprecedented budget deficits, particularly when it can be financed through a very modest increase in visitor and user fees. Recent surveys show that Americans are willing to pay more to visit their parks if they are assured that those funds will go back to enhance the parks. These funds should not be used for general operations and maintenance, but should be reinvested in preserving and restoring the very resources for which the parks were established.

It is time to act now, before the deterioration of our precious parks gets out of hand. We may not have the time and options if we wait. It is the duty of the Federal Government to be a good steward of its land, the national estate held in trust for future generations.

Senator WALLOP. Senator Hatfield, thank you very much.

I hope those who heard his words mark them down because it requires a funding effort to achieve a noble goal. There is a funding mechanism. That is part, but not all, of what is needed.

Maybe it is my opinion, too, that there is perhaps a time when we need to take a deep breath and stand down from acquisitions until we get the plant that we have in a shape that is appropriate for America as a leader in the concept of national parks in the world.

I think it is a disgrace that some of the parks that we have are not in the condition that they ought to be in. There is no point in our trying to duck that concept. It is truth, and it is truth that is visited upon its visitors from time to time, as Senator Hatfield just pointed out.

Senator Bingaman, did you have an opening statement?

STATEMENT OF HON. JEFF BINGAMAN, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Senator **Bingaman**. Mr. Chairman, I have a short one I will submit for the record. I am interested in hearing the administration's discussion of its fee proposal. I think I have some reservations about it from what I have heard, but I am interested in asking some questions when we get to them.

[The prepared statement of Senator Bingaman follows:]

Statement of Hon. Jeff Bingaman, a U.S. Senator From the State of New Mexico

Thank the Chairman for holding this hearing on an issue that is important to all Americans who visit our National Parks.

Today we consider an important change in national policy-using entrance fees to fund park programs. Since 1916, we have appropriated funds for park operations and protection. We now have a proposal to partially fund these programs from entrance fees to the Parks. It is an issue that deserves serious consideration.

I have some strong reservations for the Administration proposal. I am not convinced that public policy is best served by using entrance fees to fund programs that the Administration is unwilling to support. I cannot support a fee proposal where fees are only used to offset or reduce funds available through appropriation. If fees are to be used, it should be only as a supplement to existing programs and specifically directed to resource needs. The Administration's proposal does not provide any assurances that the revenues from these fees will be used to meet new resource needs.

I look forward to the testimony of all witnesses.

Senator **Wallop**. Thank you.

I have a statement for the record from my colleague from Wyoming, Congressman Cheney, which I will insert in the record at this point.

[The prepared statement of Representative Cheney follows:]

DICK CHENEY
WYOMING

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

STATEMENT OF REP. DICK CHENEY

Subcommittee on Public Lands, Reserved Water
and Resource Conservation
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
June 12, 1986

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased and encouraged that you are holding hearings to consider increasing the remarkably small fees that Americans pay to enter some of this country's national parks. I believe that Wyoming's four national park units, and particularly Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks, urgently need the revenue which higher park fees would help to generate.

The question before this subcommittee is not whether it is appropriate to charge an entrance fee to visitors of national parks, national monuments, and national historic sites. Since 1908, when the National Park Service began charging the drivers of cars to enter Mount Rainier National Park, Americans have come to accept paying a fee as a tiny part of the cost of a family vacation. From 1918 on, the consideration of entrance fees has been a routine policy matter. Today, about 60 attractions in the National Park Service system charge an admission fee.

If the Park Service had the authority to adjust periodically the fees it imposes, we probably would not need to hold this hearing today. But it does not: since 1979, Congress has forbidden any increases in entrance fees. While Congress can freeze adjustments in fees, it cannot freeze the number of visitors who come to see our parks. Congress cannot suspend the forces of weathering or outlaw the degradation of park roads from increasing amounts of traffic.

So while parks need more money to maintain facilities and cope with more visitors, Congress has responded by forbidding the National Park Service from raising more money through the most obvious source. The freeze on fees would be more tolerable if the fee were not so small. Even though Yellowstone charged $10 a car in 1916, the fee shrank to $2, a level at which it has been locked since 1979.

Visitors to northwestern Wyoming pay just two dollars to visit Grand Teton and Yellowstone National Parks, two of the most spectacular areas in the entire national park system. While a family of four can visit both park for two dollars, it would pay $20 to see "Guys and Dolls" at the Pink Garter Theatre in Jackson or $8 to see Arnold Schwarzenegger at the Teton Theater in "Raw Deal." Mr. Chairman, comparisons like this lead me to believe that it is not just the National Park Service that is getting the raw deal. Park visitors are not well served by a fee that fails to generate enough revenue to adequately cover maintaining park facilities.

I fully support the Administration's plan to raise entrance fees to $10 for premium parks such as Grand Teton and Yellowstone. However, I hope this committee would consider increasing the amount of money returned to the park of origin. National Park Service figures project that a $10 entrance fee would generate nearly $2 million in fiscal 1987. Of that amount, the Park Service contemplates returning $513,878 to Yellowstone. So while entrance fees would increase by 500%, the amount of the fee returned to Yellowstone Park would increase Yellowstone's budget by only about 4%.

Undoubtedly, Yellowstone would also receive additional money from other park service programs which may benefit from the park service's share of additional entrance fee revenue. But it is impossible to predict the level of funding for those programs or to know those in which Yellowstone would participate. However it comes out, the $10 fee would hardly be a windfall.

The same holds true for Grand Teton National Park. A $10 fee would generate $280,620 in additional revenue, according to Park Service figures. That would increase the park's budget by about 7%.

Mr. Chairman, while I support higher fees and believe the administration's bill would be an improvement, I would urge the committee to consider allowing parks to keep a greater share of the fees they collect. I further believe the National Park Service should retain all of the funds collected in entrance fees, instead of surrendering 20% of the revenue to the general treasury, as the administration bill contemplates.

Further, I hope Congress will favorably consider the language in the administration bill which would permit volunteers to collect entrance fees. The use of volunteers would significantly lower a park's cost of fee collection and would, in essence, enhance the park's ability to spend more of the new revenue on park enhancement.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I would hope the National Park Service would continue its current policy of allowing visitors to enter both Grand Teton and Yellowstone National Parks for a single fee. Many visitors see the Tetons on their way to Yellowstone. And, as the Chairman knows so well, the only way to get to Grand Teton from some parts of northwestern Wyoming is through Yellowstone Park. If the single fee proviso is not included in this subcommittee's legislation, I urge the Chairman to include reference to the single fee in the legislative history of the bill.

There can be no doubt that Yellowstone, Grand Teton, and many other parks in the nation desperately need more money. They need it to fix roads, to repair buildings, and to maintain a quality experience for park visitors. I strongly urge the distinguished members of the subcommittee to favorably consider the administration's program and to further consider retaining more of the money raised in entrance fees for the parks that collect it.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this statement.

Senator WALLOP. Now, Secretary Horn, accompanied by Director Mott.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM P. HORN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR; ACCOMPANIED BY WILLIAM PENN MOTT, JR., DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. HORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to provide the committee with the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2204 and S. 2130. I personally appreciate the committee's forbearance regarding the late submission of the testimony and offer my personal apology. Given the magnitude of this issue, it has taken us much longer to get our statement together than I expected, and I appreciate your forbearance on this.

Mr. Chairman, we strongly recommend the enactment of S. 2204 and, on behalf of Secretary Hodel, I wish to extend our sincere appreciation to the chairman of the full committee, Senator McClure, for introducing the legislation and to you, Mr. Chairman, for scheduling this hearing on this most critical fee initiative.

Mr. Chairman, if the President's budget for fiscal year 1987 and S. 2204 were enacted by the Congress, the National Park Service in the coming fiscal year would have the largest operating budget in its history, a total of $655 million. We think we need a budget of this size to address the types of problems that have been discussed by Senator Hatfield and by prior witnesses.

The fee revenue generated by the measure that we have proposed would comprise approximately 11 percent of available NPS operating funds, an increase of over 8 percent over current fee revenue as a percentage of such operating funds. Please note that none of the present fees collected are available for park operations. They do go in the Land and Water Conservation Fund and, if they are not expended, into the general fund.

This increase of fees to comprising approximately 11 percent of total operations would be approximately the same as the 1972 fee contribution to operations. Now, under S. 2204, the freeze on entrance fees for units of the park system would be repealed, permitting fees to be set administratively in accordance with the statutory criteria in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

Administratively under our proposal, our intent would be that only 10 of the 337 units of the National Park System would charge $10; 24 would charge $5; and the remaining 164 units would charge less than $5 entrance fees, with most charging only $1.50. Even if our proposal is to be adopted, 42 percent of the units of the National Park System will have no entrance fees.

The Golden Eagle Passport would be increased from $10 a year to $40 a year. Annual admission permits for specific park areas would be made available for those who visit only one or two parks in a particular vicinity. And, last, the Golden Age Passport, now issued free of charge, would cost a one-time fee of $10.

Under existing law, entrance fees have been effectively frozen at a maximum of $3 since 1972. However, since that time in comparative terms, the average price of entry to a baseball game has increased from $3.45 to $6.70 per individual. Entrance to movies has increased from $1.76 to at least $3.55 per individual.

When one compares the recreational experience in the parks at $10 per family for a week to over $20 per family of three to see a ballgame or over $10 per family of three to see a 90-minute movie, we are persuaded that this is a reasonable fee structure.

Another feature of the proposed fee program is that 80 percent of the increase in revenue would go directly back into the National Park System without further appropriation to be used for operations and maintenance expenses. We believe that if park users can be guaranteed that the vast bulk of their entrance fee funds were returned to the national park areas, they would not object to reasonable fee increases nor our seeking to establish fees in other parks where fees presently are not charged.

It is not our intention to offset park operations base funding as a part of our proposal. Indeed, in our proposal, coupled with the 1987 budget submission, all of the fee revenues returned to the system will provide supplemental benefits.

The assumptions which underlie S. 2204, in our mind, are very conservative. We had originally assumed a 20-percent decrease in visitation for a short period following the raising of fees. This was done as a mathematic exercise to make sure that we were not putting undue emphasis and weight to the contribution that fees would make to our overall budget.

We now question, however, whether or not there will be any decrease at all in visitation. We have conducted a fairly thorough review of the experience in State parks where States have engaged in fee increases over the past years and the review of the data in a number of States indicates that at most we would see a 1- or 2-year decrease at a maximum of only 8 percent, followed by a rapid return to normal or increased visitation levels.

Overall, when all State park systems are considered, they show an overall increase in visitation in the long term, even after fees are raised and, in some cases, raised as much as 150 percent. We believe, therefore, that the revenue estimates built into our budget and built into this measure are conservative and can be relied upon.

Mr. Chairman, the system proposed under S. 2204 is reasonable, it is needed, and we believe it is a responsible way to provide a high degree of interpretation and resources protection at the parks in this time of fiscal austerity. Therefore, we strongly recommend its enactment.

With respect to S. 2130, while we acknowledge that the measure is very well intentioned, certain aspects of the bill cause us concern. For example, the measure would require the Secretary to prepare resource management plans for NPS units, something we presently already do; develop criteria for resource management priorities; and spend up to $12 million per year addressing resource problems.

I wish to point out that we have been actively addressing many of these types of resource concerns and presently establishing, as a result of Director Mott's 12-point plan, natural resources and cultural resources management systems within the National Park

Service to deal with the types of problems addressed by the Senators earlier.

Therefore, we consider this particular measure to be unnecessary.

S. 2130 also addresses National Park Service entrance fees and their use, and although parts of that measure are similar to S. 2204, we strongly prefer S. 2204 because of the fee levels proposed in it and because those fee levels are a result of a careful analysis on a park-by-park basis of the appropriate entrance fee needs and requirements.

Our professional park managers support the fee levels contemplated by S. 2204.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared remarks. Director Mott will be addressing some of the operational aspects of the proposal and I will be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Horn follows:]

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM P. HORN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, RESERVED WATER, AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION, SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING S. 2204, THE PROPOSED NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM ENTRANCE FEE ACT OF 1986, AND S. 2130, THE PROPOSED NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM RESOURCES PRESERVATION AND REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1986.

June 12, 1986

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to provide your Committee with the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2204 and S. 2130.

We strongly recommend the enactment of S. 2204.

S. 2204 is identical to the legislation submitted to the Congress by Secretary of the Interior Donald Paul Hodel on behalf of the Administration on March 10, 1986. On behalf of Secretary Hodel, I wish to extend our sincere appreciation to the Chairman of the Full Committee, Senator McClure, for introducing the legislation and to the Chairman of the Subcommittee, Senator Wallop, for scheduling this hearing on this most important fee initiative.

Mr. Chairman, if the President's Budget and S. 2204 were enacted by the Congress, the National Park Service would have the largest operating budget in its history--$655 million. The fee revenue would comprise approximately 11% of available NPS operating funds, an increase of 8% over current fee revenue as a percentage of operating funds, none of which is now available for park operations. This would be approximately the same as the 1972 fee revenue level.

Under S. 2204:

--The freeze on entrance fees for units of the National Park System would be repealed, permitting entrance fees to be set administratively in accordance with the criteria in Section 4 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

--Administratively, under our proposal our intent would be that only 10 parks would charge $10, 24 would charge $5, and the remaining 164 would charge less than $5, with most charging only $1.50.

--The Golden Eagle Passport would be increased from $10.00 per year to $40.00 per year.

--Annual admission permits for specific park areas would be made available for those who visit only one or two parks in the immediate vicinity.

--The Golden Age Passport, now issued free of charge, would cost a one time fee of $10.00.

--Volunteers would be authorized to sell permits and collect fees.

Under existing law, entrance fees have been effectively frozen at a maximum of $3.00 since 1972. That maximum, incidentally, has only been charged at one park, and most charge $1 or $2. During the same period of time; that is, since 1972; the average price of entry to a baseball game has increased from $3.45 to $6.70 per individual and entry to movies has increased from $1.76 to at least $3.55 per individual. When one compares the recreational experience in the parks at $10 per family for a week to over $20 per family of three to see a ballgame or over $10 per family of three to see a movie, we conclude this is a reasonable fee. A total of $21 million per year is now collected in entrance and user fees, and only about 18% of the 337 national park areas even charge entrance fees. Under S. 2204, over half of the 337 parks would charge fees. Under S. 2204, entrance fee revenue would increase by $52 million to $61 million per year.

Another feature of this proposed fee program is that 80% of the increase in revenue would go directly back into the National Park System without further appropriation, to be used for operations and maintenance expenses. We believe that if park users can be guaranteed that their entrance fees were returned to the national park areas, they will not object to the reasonable fee increases we seek nor to establishing fees in other parks. It is not our intention to offset park operations base funding as a part of our proposal. The remaining 20% would be deposited into the general fund as a contribution to deficit reduction.

The assumptions which underly S. 2204 are very conservative. We had originally assumed a 20% decrease in visitation for a short period following the raising of fees. We now question whether there will be a decrease at all in visitation. Changes in world conditions, low gas prices and the improved economy may mean that we have actually underestimated park visitation this year. Without a decrease in visitation, our revenues would be even greater. Furthermore a review of the experience in State parks would indicate a one or two year decrease at a maximum of only 8%, followed by a return to normal visitation. Overall, when all State park systems are considered they show an overall increase in visitation in the long-term even after fees are raised. We believe the revenue estimates are therefore conservative. The fee schedule we have developed applied the criteria in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act on a park-by-park basis. The appropriate fee was multiplied by the visitation projection. Thus, the revenue estimate is not arbitrary nor aimed at a fixed revenue target. Additionally, the assumptions of revenue from the Golden Age and Golden Eagle passport are based on historical experience.

Mr. Chairman, the system proposed by S. 2204 is reasonable, it is needed, and we believe it is a responsible way to provide a high degree of interpretation and resources protection at the parks in times of fiscal austerity. We strongly recommend its enactment.

With respect to S. 2130, while we acknowledge that the bill is well-intentioned, certain respects of the bill causes us problems. For example, the bill would require the Secretary to prepare resource management plans for NPS units, develop criteria for resource management priorities, and spend up to $12 million per year addressing resource problems. It would further require preparation of various reports and would require specific training for National Park Service personnel. All of these provisions could be fulfilled using existing authorities. We believe the professional management of the National Park Service should continue to apply the national park policies already established by the Congress to its day-to-day park management.

To that end, we wish to point out that we have been actively addressing many of these kinds of resource concerns through our own administrative processes. For example, park units are already required to produce resource management plans; extensive staff training is provided in resources management; and we regularly report on the status of various park programs as part of the general oversight authority exercised by the Congress.

Moreoever, we maintain active interagency communication with other Federal land managing agencies as required to ensure the protection of park resources, and we are continually seeking ways to improve and maintain the quality of park resources. This is a major reason that we have supported increased fees as a means of ensuring that these precious resources are not neglected or forgotten in tight budgetary times.

S. 2130 also would require the Secretary to make available $2 million per year for matching grants to non-profit organizations, educational institutions, and State and local agencies for preservation, monitoring, and interpretation of park resources. Further, appropriations of $50 million per year would be authorized for the next 10 years to carry out the provisions of S. 2130. We believe such expenditures are inconsistent with current needs to control Federal spending.

S. 2130 also addresses National Park Service entrance fees and their use. The fee provisions differ somewhat from those we recommend in S. 2204, resulting in fee levels generally lower than in our proposal. Although this part of S. 2130 is similar to S. 2204 in several respects, including permitting the National Park Service to retain, without further appropriation, all receipts from entrance and user fees for the next ten years, we prefer S. 2204 because the fee levels proposed in S. 2204 are the result of careful analysis on a park-by-park basis of the appropriate entrance fee needs and requirements. Our professional park managers support the fee levels contemplated by S. 2204.

This concludes my prepared remarks, Mr. Chairman. The Director will address the operational aspects of the proposal in his statement. We will be pleased to answer any questions you or other members of the Subcommittee may have.

Senator WALLOP. Thank you, Secretary.
Director Mott.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM PENN MOTT, JR., DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MOTT. I have a prepared statement that I will enter into the record. I would like to make one or two comments in connection with the program.

Senator WALLOP. Would you pull the microphone down a little bit, please, Director?

Mr. MOTT. Senator Hatfield made some remarks with regard to our resources and I would like to, for the record, state that we have this 12-point plan and now have a supplement to that which is our action program. There are three very important elements of the National Park System that I think we have to pay particular attention to—that is, interpretation, so that we can educate the public as to the out-of-doors and their responsibility to it and to understand the resources, research, and resource management.

Those are our highest priorities and the ones that we are putting a great deal of attention to. So we will be carrying out that program as effectively as we can and with the funds that are available.

This program that we have established on fees will make it possible for us to carry out those three objectives in a very effective and efficient way. I am very supportive of the program.

My experience as director of the California State Park System is that the people are very willing to pay for fees and increased fees such as we are suggesting, provided that money goes to the National Park System and not into the general fund of the Treasury.

Second, I would like to also indicate to you that in California when the fees increased, the attendance dropped very slightly and then came back again with an increase, and I suspect that that will be true in the National Park Service. With the increases that we anticipate this year, I think that we will find that fees will not be a deterrent insofar as attendance is concerned at the National Park Service level.

I am prepared to answer questions with regard to the details of how we expect to use these funds, but basically we are talking about using them for interpretation, research, and resource management.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Mott follows:]

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM PENN MOTT, JR., DIRECTOR NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, RESERVED WATER, AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION, SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, IN SUPPORT OF S. 2204, A BILL TO AMEND THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1965, TO PERMIT THE USE OF PARK ENTRANCE, ADMISSION, AND RECREATION USE FEES FOR THE OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.

June 12, 1986

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my personal views as Director of the National Park Service to what Assistant Secretary Horn has described.

First, as I stated at the oversight hearing which your Subcommittee held on June 27, 1985, I believe people expect and are willing to assist in the development and maintenance of park facilities by paying a reasonable fee for their special use and enjoyment. The key to the visitors' willingness to pay a reasonable fee is the commitment in the legislation that visitor fees will be collected and kept by the National Park Service, to be used strictly for park purposes. The legislation the Administration has recommended, and which Chairman McClure has introduced, is a contract. In return for increased admission fees, we promise to do the necessary research in order that we can maintain the quality of the park's resources and continue to build and increase our interpretive services that our park users have come to value.

Under our proposal $59 million would be available to the National Park Service beginning in fiscal year 1987 to carry out a variety of programs and projects. These include fee collection costs, visitor transportation systems, informational publications, exhibit rehabilitation programs, cultural and natural resources management, volunteers in parks, and repair and rehabilitation. Approximately $14.2 million will be used to supplement the budgets of all parks for interpretation, research, and resources management as follows: 50 percent, or $7.1 million, will be distributed to those parks which collect fees in proportion to the amount they collect; the other $7.1 million will be distributed to all park areas based on their operating budgets.

My experience as Director of the California State parks during a period of severe fiscal constraint was that those individuals who use parks do not object to reasonable entrance and user fees provided those fees are retained by the park to help finance the operation of parks. Fees are presently charged at 60 units of the National Park System. The proposed plan envisions collecting entrance fees at approximately 198 units of the system. We have worked hard to develop a sound, equitable proposal for charging reasonable entrance fees and identifying those parks where the fees should be collected. S. 2204, if enacted, will enable us to enter into and fulfill a contract with park visitors by assuring that a substantial portion of the entrance and [illegible]ay will make it possible for us to do a better job of education and interpretation, resource management and improved maintenance in the National Park System.

This concludes my prepared remarks Mr. Chairman. I would be pleased to respond to any questions you or other members of the Subcommittee may have.

Senator **Wallop**. Thank you, Director Mott.

Senator Bingaman.

Senator **Bingaman**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me just ask a few questions here about S. 2204. I am a bit confused about the intended use of all these funds. As I read 2204 and I believe, Secretary Horn, in your statement you allude to this also, the administration is proposing to use 20 percent of these increased fees for deficit reduction.

Obviously, I think all of us are in favor of deficit reduction, but I do not understand the rationale. The administration is telling us here in the Congress that any kind of increase in taxes would prompt a Presidential veto, and here he is proposing an increase of park user fees to apply to the deficit, 20 percent to apply to the deficit.

How do you explain this difference?

Mr. **Horn**. Mr. Chairman, in putting together our park fee proposal, it is my personal conclusion that there has to be an across-the-board effort to engage in deficit reduction, and being part of the administration we thought it would be appropriate to make some minor contribution in that area through the fee system. That is part 1.

Second, and probably far more important in my mind, making an upfront contribution to the general fund of the Treasury is a way of ensuring and forestalling future efforts to offset base funding. One of the big problems, I think, that has afflicted most fee proposals in the past has been that you reduce base funding and then basically make that back up with a fee increase.

Our proposal right now has all of this money, the 80-percent part being totally supplemental, on top of existing base funding, and I think in order to keep offsets from being proposed in the future, if we make an upfront contribution, say we gave at the office, so to speak, we would be able to hold our line and to hold our own in terms of continuing base funding which I think is very critical.

Senator **Bingaman**. Let me just say I think, Secretary Horn, your experience around here is different than mine if you think that giving this year is going to put you in good stead so that nobody will ask you to give again next year.

But let me ask, Director Mott, you had said that when you were in charge in California, you felt that the public was in favor or would go along with increased fees for parks as long as they knew that they were going to improve the quality of the parks or the upkeep of the parks, and not just going into the general fund. I think that is what you just said in your statement.

Mr. **Mott**. That is correct.

Senator **Bingaman**. What do you think the public reaction is to the idea that their park fees are going to be increased to apply to the deficit?

Mr. **Mott**. I suspect that the public would prefer that the money be used for park purposes.

Senator **Bingaman**. All right.

Let me ask about this 80 percent that is allocated to the parks. I heard Secretary Horn say that this is really a complement of existing resources and not a supplement, but as I understand it the suggestion here is that these revenues will replace or are intended not to replace existing expenditures.

My information—tell me if this is wrong—but my information is that only $14.2 million of the proposed $73.8 million projected to be raised under this legislation would be allocated to projects that were not previously funded by appropriations. Is that wrong?

Mr. HORN. Let me outline the entire history of it. Our funding for operations in fiscal year 1986, after the 4.3-percent sequestration, is a total of $596 million. That is the base operational amount that we are working on at this time. That is what we are using to run the Park System.

Our fiscal year 1987 request is also $596 million. It is the exact same amount with no reduction. The $59 million which would be our 80-percent share would basically be added to that $596 million. What has happened as a result of the Gramm-Rudman exercise, is that some programs were reduced, moving from fiscal year 1985 to fiscal year 1986 when we were dropped down by Congress to the $596 million level.

Some of the programs that we were running in fiscal year 1985 would be restored through the application of these fee moneys.

Senator BINGAMAN. So what you are saying is that the additional fees will be used to make up the shortfall caused by Gramm-Rudman.

Mr. HORN. In some respects, yes, because Gramm-Rudman with the 4.3 percent sequestration dropped us to a total appropriation of $596 million for operations. Basically what we are doing is restoring that, plus adding additional money on top of Gramm-Rudman cuts to bring us back up to, as I said, an all-time-high level for operational budgets in fiscal year 1987.

Senator BINGAMAN. But if I understand it correctly, the proposal here is that we take programs that were funded in the 1985 budget that were not able to be funded in 1986 because of Gramm-Rudman, and here we fund them again through the use of increased user fees instead of appropriated funds.

Mr. HORN. In some limited respects, yes. In other words, our response was Congress dropped us to this $596 million level. We have agreed that we are not going to drop it any further, and our 1987 budget takes it straight out, and then we use the fees to build ourselves back up essentially to this all time high of $655 million.

Senator BINGAMAN. I guess my question is what about the next 4 years of Gramm-Rudman? If we have other cuts of appropriated fund levels, would it be your intention to pick up that additional shortfall as well through increased user fees so we would shift more and more of the funding of our Federal parks or our National Park System over to the public and take it out of appropriated funds?

Mr. HORN. No. Our intent is to essentially hold the base appropriated amount for operations right where it is, and we would like to continue that in the outyears. Congress gave us $596 million in this present fiscal year; we would like to hold our operational level right there and use fee money to provide us supplemental benefits in the outyears.

Senator BINGAMAN. So you are going back to the postsequestration figure and saying that is our base; any increase in cost of running the parks we will try to pick up in the coming years from increased fees to charge to the public.

Mr. HORN. As I indicated, with the fee amount even, we take 80 percent of the revenues that we project, added to the congressionally appropriated $596 million base and we will have the largest operating budget in the history of the Park Service in fiscal year 1987. Based on the fact that I think our fee revenue projections are somewhat on the conservative side, if we are able to hold the same base line in 1988, we would be looking at even another increase in operations to another all-time record level in fiscal year 1988.

I am not sure I could predict or project much more accurately beyond that, but I think that the budget approach that we have taken, coupled with this fee initiative, assures us of really first class operational budgets over at least the next few years.

Senator BINGAMAN. Am I right that the receipts you presently receive from fees are deposited in the Land and Water Conservation Fund?

Mr. HORN. That is correct.

Senator BINGAMAN. That is used for Federal land acquisition and grants to States for parkland acquisition and development?

Mr. HORN. Yes; it is. The problem that we have seen with that is prior to 1980, some or all of that money was available for park operational purposes, and Congress changed the law in 1980 to shift that money into the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The problem we have from an operational perspective is that if LWCF money is not appropriated after a period of time, that money automatically reverts to the general fund and is no longer available for Park Service benefits. We would like to basically just take it back——

Senator BINGAMAN. I am having a little trouble following your reasoning here. We do not mind taking 20 percent of the fees we are going to charge this next year and turning them over to the general treasury, but we do not want the fees that we charge that go into the Land and Water Conservation Fund to revert to the general treasury.

How does that follow?

Mr. HORN. I think what it relates to is it is an effort on an aggregate basis, when you take the entire package together, to provide supplemental benefits to the Park Service. We come out ahead, even under the 80 percent arrangement, with a net flowing to us of $59 million. That includes the $21 million of existing fee revenues that are not available to us for any operational benefits.

Senator BINGAMAN. But your proposal in this legislation is that none of these fees would go into the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the future if we adopt this bill; is that right?

Mr. HORN. That is right. All of the park entrance fees, the present fees and the new fees authorized by S. 2204, would be made available for addition basically to the Park Service operational account.

Senator BINGAMAN. Let me just ask about this Volunteers in Parks Program. I understand that that was cut out of the budget entirely and would be one of those programs that would be funded if this fee increase would go forward; is that right?

Mr. MOTT. That is correct.

Senator BINGAMAN. And I guess that is true for the other four or five programs as well? There are five park programs that fall into this same category; is that accurate? The maintenance, repair and rehabilitation projects; the Cultural Resource Preservation Program; the Natural Resource Preservation Program—those are all programs which will be funded if we increase these fees as proposed, but will not be otherwise?

Mr. HORN. That is assuming that Congress leaves our operating base at $596 million per the President's request, which is the present level of funding.

Senator BINGAMAN. OK.

Let me just ask also, getting down to some very specifics that I am familiar with, in my home State of New Mexico one of the fee increases you are proposing is for Fort Union which is not a very frequently visited location in our State. The proposal is to go from no fee to a $5 fee, as I understand it here, and the total number of visitors or vehicles last year in 1985, total number of vehicles were 4,176.

I was just going to ask on that, what do you anticipate as far as increased cost of collecting these fees? When you take $5 from—I mean assuming that everybody, these 4,176 cars that stopped there last year, or in 1985, would still stop and pay the $5, that is $5 times 4,000; that is about $20,000 that we would collect by doing this.

What would it cost to administer this fee collection program and how much of that would be absorbed? I am just wondering if we are breaking even on this.

Mr. HORN. Let me see if I can find my fancy pie chart. This program was put together basically from the bottom up. We did not operate off any type of a plug number that we had to arbitrarily match up with. We have estimated the cost of collection and that is built in—20 percent. That is apparently the estimate that we expect based on past experience in collecting $21 million to be the cost of collecting——

Senator BINGAMAN. So at this particular park, you think you could implement a collection fee or a collection system and account for those funds and all for about $4,000, is that right, for the year?

Mr. HORN. I would have to defer to the superintendent and the regional offices as to the particular details on that. But on an aggregate basis, when you looked at the entire $75 million fee program, our expectation was approximately 20 percent used for cost of collection.

Senator BINGAMAN. Let me just say, without asking more questions, because this is a specific, it just seems unlikely or improbable to me that you could implement a collection fee of $5 there at that park and keep track of it and all, and do all of that for a total increased cost of $4,000.

It also seems improbable to me that you are going to get that full 4,176 people to stop if you are charging them $5 instead of nothing at that particular facility. I don't know; maybe that is an unusual case.

Mr. HORN. There are two factors. No. 1, one of the things that we have asked for in the legislation is a specific authorization that we allow volunteers to be allowed to man the collection booths and gates to collect the fees. We think that we had a very successful, active volunteer involvement with our Park System over the years, and if we can employ those volunteers to help us in the collection effort, obviously that means the overhead costs are at a bare minimum. That is number one.

No. 2, based on the review that we did of other State Park Systems to see what were the consequences of fee increases, as I said we built in this estimate of 20 percent visitation decrease so that the numbers remain conservative, but based on a review of what has happened in a multiplicity of States, the result has been in most cases you might get a minor drop the year after you get a significant increase in fees, but you get it all back within a couple of years later.

So that basically the fees on a State park basis have appeared to have no adverse effect whatsoever, within a two- to three-year period, on the level of visitation.

Senator BINGAMAN. Let me just sort of finish the loop here. As I understand it, you are saying that it is not going to cost that much to collect the fees because we are going to use volunteers in this Volunteers in Parks Program to get it done. We are not going to fund the Volunteers in Parks Program unless we raise the fees.

Is that what you are saying?

Mr. HORN. It is in essence an accounting exercise, because we had to show the appropriations and budget folks what we would do and how we would spend this particular money.

As I said, the operations budget was put together to target for a total of $655 million after we added the fee revenues into our base account and, looking at the fees, looking to efficiently collect the fees, concluded that if we got the expressed congressional authorization to use the volunteers, we could use some of that money to basically help do an efficient job.

Now, beyond that, of course, we are not going to be using volunteers solely and only for the purpose of fee collection. We employ—not employ in the technical sense, but have a relationship with volunteers that extends to an entire range of park-related issues—and the volunteers are a very, very important part of our system.

Senator BINGAMAN. That is all I had, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Senator WALLOP. Thank you, Senator Bingaman. Let me just suggest at least 60 percent of your questions could as well be directed to the Congress itself as to the Park Service. They have no reach into what we do not do with the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and what we do not do with it is legion.

A lot of us have been very distressed at Congress's refusal to appropriate money out of the Land and Water Conservation Fund for most any of the purposes for which it was originally devised.

I don't know quite how we reach, frankly, Congress's penchant for offsetting. One way is the way you suggest; that a portion of it go to the general fund. Then the statement is that we gave at the office. I don't trust us; but I don't trust us if none of it goes to the general fund either, and in tight budget times we see this penchant for fudging at the edges. It would be my hope that we would have somehow or another, between your 12-point plan, Director Mott, and some other kinds of statements, a long-term plan, funding plan, which would probably show some rise.

I do not think that it is appropriate to contemplate just level funding, absent any fees for the next 10 years. At least give us a guideline from which to protect against a raid on the collection of fees.

Do you think you could possibly arrange for such a study and a projection for us?

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, we would be glad to work on it and work with you to see that we put something together that meets your needs.

[Subsequent to the hearing the Department of the Interior submitted the following:]

The administration believes that the funding level for operation of the National Park System should remain constant at the President's budget request for fiscal 1987 of 596 million dollars. The administration believes that this level is appropriate for at least the next three years, but we have no recommendation as to an appropriate level beyond that period.

Senator WALLOP. You understand what I am trying to get at; that we will need here in this committee and against other raiders, a projection of what funding should be for the system. I am on the Finance Committee and know precisely how inaccurate a 5-year projection is. But still, we need something to measure against.

Tony has given me a note which I think is true. You give them an impossible task if you go to OMB. I don't know if there is a subterranean way that we can bypass OMB in this process, but perhaps it would be that without costing it, you will just on the basis of currently known needs and currently known operating requirements, that you would push out those requirements even without cost, just assuming that there would be some level in there.

But perhaps if we can work together on that, we could find some raid insurance.

Mr. HORN. I would add that I think fortunately, the outyear projections on our budget attached in the budget planning documents do indicate over at least the next few years—the next couple of years—flat, consistent funding for our operations at this congressionally established $596 million level.

In that sense, if that can be realized by both our budget and by subsequent congressional action, that would ensure in essence that anything that comes out of fees does remain supplemental.

Senator WALLOP. Director Mott, and you, Mr. Secretary, both have given us some indication of how you plan to use the discretionary authority under S. 2204 to divide the fees collected with the parks where they are collected and where no fees are collected—and to regions.

Can you give me a breakdown of how these fees might go? You have some parks where you are going to be collecting fees. You have got parks where you obviously can collect no fees, and you have regions. You said basically you are talking about interpretive and other things.

I assume that those criteria of which you spoke will be that which is spent in park, but I assume that there are regional requirements as well.

Mr. MOTT. All of the parks in the system would benefit from the allocation of the $45 million of money that we collect through the programs that are indicated in our testimony; that is, for interpretation, research and resource management.

The balance of that money, approximately $14 million, will be allocated on the basis of 50/50. Fifty percent of that $14 million will go to the parks that have collected money for special projects in this field of interpretation, resource management, and research. Fifty percent of that money, approximately $7 million, will be allocated to those parks that did not collect money for one reason or another, either legally or because of multiple entrances, and that money will be used for those parks for research, interpretation, and resource management.

Senator WALLOP. Let me ask once more. Fifty percent of that reserve for the park goes to the park that collects it; is that correct?

Mr. MOTT. Correct.

Senator WALLOP. The other 50 percent goes to those parks who do not collect it, or to all parks?

Mr. MOTT. To all parks. If you are taking the total amount now.

Senator WALLOP. What I am asking you for is what is in it for the parks that collect it?

Mr. MOTT. They share in the $45 million that is allocated to these various projects.

Senator WALLOP. How is that done?

Mr. MOTT. By their budget, based on the percent of——

Senator WALLOP. You see, one of the things, if they have to pay out of their budget the cost of collection of 20 percent, then they give up 80 percent of it, which is the 20 percent that goes to the General Fund and 20 percent that goes—and 50 percent of the remainder of it—what is in it for them? They are just going to be a direct offset.

Mr. MOTT. It is not going to cost them anything to collect because the money—they are going to be reimbursed for their collection. That is the first thing that happens. They get reimbursed, which is an estimate of about $20 million. They will get reimbursed that amount.

Then the balance of that money will be used for the purposes as we have indicated for research and so forth.

Senator WALLOP. So it is the balance of the money after the cost of collection. That is, the 20/40/40.

Mr. MOTT. That is right.

Senator WALLOP. OK. For the record, though, according to your figures, there is still a $45 million pot that nobody knows how it is going to get allocated.

Mr. MOTT. $45 million would be allocated to those areas that have general requirements throughout the system; in other words, visitor service, interpretation, research, resource management, both cultural and natural resource management.

Senator WALLOP. Into the Washington office?

Mr. MOTT. Not necessarily.

Senator WALLOP. Not necessarily, but——

Mr. MOTT. No; it is going to the field.

Senator WALLOP. It is going to the field.

Could we get a breakdown of your anticipated projections?

Mr. MOTT. Yes. We have that all in detail and we would be glad to furnish it for the record.

[The information follows:]

Under our current proposal for the distribution of funds, $44.8 million of the $59 million will be distributed primarily through servicewide programs related to interpretation, research and resource management, benefiting all the parks, after a portion of this amount has been allocated to cover the costs of collection. Of the remaining $14.2 million, $7.1 million will be distributed to all parks proportionally on the basis of their fiscal year 1987 budgets, with an additional $7.1 million returned directly to the collecting areas to augment park programs.

Senator WALLOP. Thank you.

Now, Grand Teton and Yellowstone Park presently have a joint single visit vehicle fee of $2. Do you plan to retain this joint fee for a single visit?

Mr. MOTT. In our present fee schedule, as you know, we have introduced a new classification and that is for those people who live in the vicinity of a national park. They will get a special annual fee to go to the park so that they can take their visitors, and that fee is based on the initial cost of going into that park.

With regard to the unique situation at Yellowstone and Grand Teton, we are thinking that we would have a basic fee schedule for those two parks so that you could go to either one with that fee schedule.

Senator WALLOP. In other words, maintain the joint fee?

Mr. MOTT. Right.

Senator WALLOP. It is interesting that in 1916 it was $10 a car. Had that kept pace with the times, it might be a rare experience. But surely $2 is too low in terms of almost any measurement.

I for one am hopeful that we can do this. I really regret that the Senate did not see fit to, on a temporary basis, make those available for this summer because one of the concerns that I have is that with the budget that the Congress has approved for you, and with the increase in visitorship, you want those people to have this year, those new entrants to the park experience, have a quality experience.

It has become extremely difficult for you and we are aware of it. I am sorry we did not get that, but that is something we have yet to work on.

Now, in the administration's submission on S. 2204, there is a document called appendix B. Application of the fee development criteria shows that the National Park Service used the criteria of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

I am going to put appendix B in the record and I would ask that either you, Mr. Secretary, or Mr. Mott for the record to give a summary of that study.

[Appendix B to S. 2204 follows:]

APPENDIX B
APPLICATION OF THE FEE DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

The entry fee criteria are based upon the six legislative criteria stated in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, Public Law 88-578. and also articulated in the GAO Report To The Congress entitled "Increasing Entrance Fees--National Park Service". These criteria and their accompanying point-scoring values as determined by the study team's entrance fee rating model are as follows:

1. **The direct and indirect cost to the government criterion** is based upon the projected FY86 operations budget for the parks.

Points	Determining factors
3	Annual operational budget in excess of $1 million
2	Annual operational budget between $.5 and $1 million
1	Annual operational budget less than $.5 million

*** Based on FY86 budget figures

2. **The visitor benefits criterion** is based upon two marketing principles:

   a. Depth of experience provided: (1) A single focus park indicates that the park has one major theme or activity use, and is typically used by the visitor for a half day or less. (2) A multi-focus park indicates that the park has a variety of different activities available to the visitor. Visitors typically spend the entire day involved in either a variety of activities or a single type of activity that is so broad or far-reaching in scope that it takes a full day or more to experience.

1	Primarily a single focus park
2	Multi focus park

   b. Cost per visit is the cost to the government to provide the service on a per-person basis.

Points	Determining factors
-1	Cost per visit less than $2
0	Cost per visit between $2 and $5
0	Cost per visit not known
1	Cost per visit between $5 and $10
2	Cost per visit over $10

*** Based on FY86 budget and FY84 visitation figures

3. **The comparable fees charged by non-federal public agencies criterion**is based upon the projected cost of what a vehicle with 3.2 persons (standard number of visitors per vehicle) would expend for a similar experience in the surrounding/representative geographic area. This criterion is similar to the current requirements used in determining campground and park housing fees. For historic sites and recreational areas, in most cases, comparable costs are quite easily derived from surrounding similar state and private sites. For natural areas, the uniqueness of the site was the determining factor in the context of the geographical area. For those areas which have been recognized on an international basis — such as World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves, and areas whose uniqueness draws large numbers of international visitors — the geographical area was determinied to be the world. For these parks, comparable costs were determined from commensurate costs for similar experiences on a worldwide basis. Areas of lesser significance were rated accordingly:

Points	Determining factors
-2	Comparables less than $2
0	Comparables between $2 and $5
0	No comparbility possible
1	Comparables between $5 and $10
2	Comparables over $10

4. **The public policy or interest served criterion** was the most subjective, philosophically complex, and politically sensitive of all the criteria. It should be, and was applied with the widest possible input of various public officials. In the 103 current or proposed entrance fee parks, this criterion was deemed non-appropriate to use. Examples of where highest level management may wish to exercise this criterion are:

   a. Negative points: Symbolically sensitive areas such as: The Statue of Liberty; the White House; and, the Lincoln Memorial.

   b. Negative points: Urban recreation areas located in and heavily utilized by very low income visitors.

   c. Positive points: Areas where the low cost of operation and high use rate rusults in a total score, and resultant per visit cost which is less than that currently being charged.

   d. Positive points: An area where projected revenue would be five or six times the cost to the government to operate the park.

Points	Determining Factors
0 to -7	Based upon estalished norms for the relationship of the park to its place in the National cultural and natural heritage of the Nation.

5. **The other pertinent factors criterion** is another criterion that should be,

and was, used in only extremely unique situations. As opposed to the issues of national policy (criterion 4), this criterion is to be used to offset a total score that has been obviously distorted because of very unusual circumstances. Two examples would be:

a. A park where visitation was extremely low (resulting in a high cost per visit ratio) because of being closed for an extended period due to hurricane or fire damage.

b. A new park unit whose operational budget is high and visitation is low because of the costs of extra staff for land acquisition or historical research.

Points	Determining Factors
+2 to -2	Extremely unique situations administratively determined to effectively render the overall criteria as invalid and in need of adjustment

6. **The economic and administrative feasibility of fee collection criterion** was utilized in a very straight-forward manner: Either it is feasible to collect entrance fees or it is not. Although the criterion is straightforward, its application may not be. Part of the reason for this confusion is that its application in many cases is based upon the traditional concept that entrance fees can only be collected at an entrance gate. This study categorically rejects this notion. There are literally hundreds of examples of non-federal areas where it is common practice to charge entrance fees and to require patrons to come to a visitor center or other central location to purchase their entrance tickets. Some of these examples are ski areas, several Canadian parks, and numerous historic sites. Other non-entrance fee examples which follow this same philosophy are out-of-state daily fishing permits, our own back-country camping permits, and lock-box parking areas.

Points	Determining Factors
x1	Fee collection economically and administratively feasible.
x0	Fee collection not economically or administratively feasible

*** The sub-total of the first five criteria are multiplied by 1 if fee collection is feasible or by 0 if fee collection is not feasible.

Examples

Park	Crtr. #1	Crtr. #2	Crtr. #3	Crtr. #4	Crtr. #5	SUB TOTAL	Crtr. #6	TOTAL SCORE	PARK FEE (per vehicle)
Yellowstone NP	3	2 1	2	0	0	8	x1	8	$10.00
Shenandoah NP	3	2 0	1	0	0	6	x1	6	$5.00
Colonial NHP	3	1 -1	1	0	0	4	x1	4	$3.00

APPENDIX C

POINT CONVERSION CHART

Final Score for Park	Category
Less than 2 points	Non Fee Area
2 or 3 points	Standard Fee Area
4, 5, or 6 points	Intermediate Fee Area
7 or more points	Prime Fee Area

Senator WALLOP. Then I have one last thing. In your statement, Secretary Horn, on the second page you say administratively, under your proposal, your intent would be that only 10 parks would charge $10; 24, $5; and the remaining 164 would charge less than $5, with most charging only $1.50.

Can you collect $1.50 and make sense?

Mr. HORN. I asked that same question and, as I said, this proposal and program was put together from the bottom up. We did not pick a number out of the sky and then say, guys, bring me a plan.

Senator WALLOP. The problem with that is that sounds almost more like nuisance.

Mr. HORN. I said much the same thing. Isn't it easier to charge $2 than to give back 50 cents in change? It has been put together basically at the local level. I think the people who have operated fee programs and fee collections on the ground are persuaded that the $1.50 is a reasonable approach and does not constitute any form of administrative nuisance, so I am deferring to their judgment.

Senator WALLOP. Can I ask you to go back, since we have now time, and rethink that because there is a real problem that we are facing here. I assume that if we have success in raising the fees, that will be it for the rest of this century. If you have a fee in there that is too low and costs more to collect than it does by way of return, we are going to have a hell of a time getting that changed.

It would be a shame to have to drop it, having taking the appropriate heat to establish it. I mean my hope is that you go back and rethink that. We are not going to get this apparently in time for this year's budget that we are working on. But it is just the thought that it does not seem to make a whole lot of sense. If it does, fine, but it seems sort of a casual figure.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, we have by formula worked out what the revenue production might be from those parks where we can collect a fee, and we have used a formula based on the criteria in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. We feel that we should have the flexibility administratively to review those fees so that we do not get into the situation where we are charging $1.50 when it would be just as easy to collect $2, but we had to start from some base and that is what we have done.

Senator WALLOP. My problem is that I have been around here longer than you have and I have seen how Congress reacts to the whole question of fees, which you are now saying today.

I have anxiety about that figure. If you want flexibility to go down from a figure, that is fine; but I very much doubt we will be able to give you flexibility to go up from one, however badly I might want to support you in that concept. That is why I am asking you perhaps to revisit it. Whatever flexibility you are going to have would be not to charge the maximum, I guess.

I do not see any way in the world that I can persuade my subcommittee members, probably not even my vice chairman and ranking member here, of that concept. It is better, if you are going to do this concept to try to think it as thoroughly through as you can from the political perspective as well as just immediate business perspective.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, we would be glad to look at it, and we will take a good hard look.

Senator WALLOP. I requested that GAO do three studies or factsheets. One is very pertinent to this hearing. It is entitled "Recreational Fee Authorizations, Prohibitions and Limitation," and it is available for your use. Parts of the factsheet were used in the memo as the committee background for this hearing.

It gives you some idea of why I have anxiety about starting with a fee that is too low and attempting to adjust it in any near term or real time situation.

Senator Bumpers.

Senator BUMPERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Mott, let me say first of all that my intractable attitude about the parks fees has been changed to some extent but not to the extent the administration requests. I have a problem with this proposal and I will tell you what it is. I am not going to totally resist the idea of increasing some fees at some parks. One of the chief issues I stressed during my race for Governor in my State was the condition of our State parks. I discovered as I traveled the State running for Governor that the State park system was a disgrace. I could not recommend a single State park to anybody but my worst enemy.

I ran on that issue and I said that the State would not only build additional parks, but would also upgrade the parks we had to the point that they would be a source of pride. When I won the election and went to the legislature, I told the legislature that I wanted them to do this, not for people who traveled through Arkansas or who even came to Arkansas from other States to visit our parks. I wanted them to do this for our people.

Everybody can't go to Yosemite and Yellowstone. Some people have to vacation near home, and I wanted these State parks available to our own people. Anything we would get in tourism dollars as a result of our State parks would just be in addition. We have a saying down there. We love tourists because they are worth a bale of cotton and twice as easy to pick. [Laughter.]

We appropriated more money for the State park system my first year as Governor than had been appropriated collectively in the entire history of the system. And, of course, we take great pride now in our parks and we have not only upgraded all of them, but have also built three really magnificent new parks.

Let me ask you the first question. Does the Park Service still believe that we ought to raise 25 percent of the operations of the parks from fees?

Mr. MOTT. I do not think that that is possible through this new fee schedule that we are recommending.

Senator BUMPERS. I know this fee schedule doesn't do it.

Mr. MOTT. We would raise 11 percent and come from 3 percent up to 11 percent.

Senator BUMPERS. Incidentally, in connection with what I was saying a moment ago, I find almost odious the comparison between going to one of our national parks and going to a movie or a baseball game or any of those things. I don't see those on all fours. We have always appropriated money for our parks because we wanted to preserve them and the resources in them and we wanted to make them available to our people as an esthetic experience and as a vacation place that would be relatively cheap.

They have never, nor will they ever, be self-sustaining and I don't think we ought to be trying to move in that direction.

Only 60 parks now have entrance fees. How many parks would charge entrance fees under the administration bill?

Mr. HORN. 194.

Senator BUMPERS. 194?

Mr. HORN. 58 percent of the parks would have entrance fees; 42 percent of the parks would have no entrance fees.

Senator BUMPERS. If one of the rationales for this proposal is that if people have the money to drive those great distances, they have the money to pay more fees, why are we still excluding Alaska from any entrance fees?

Mr. HORN. We have there a statutory bar on it, and frankly, one of the critical factors——

Senator BUMPERS. I know we have a statutory bar, but then that is what we are dealing with here.

Mr. HORN. One of the others is an administrative factor: Is there a way to collect a fee? And the way you get into virtually all the Alaska parks is you get in a float plane and you fly out to some remote lake and there is just no way for us to collect a fee unless we want to go with some type of a stamp system that frankly would be totally unenforceable.

So that that is why an awful lot of the parks have been left off the list. There is just no effective, efficient way for us to collect a fee. There is no gate to have somebody drive through.

Senator BUMPERS. There are 10 highways in the Hot Springs National Park, which is nothing more or less than a city, and you propose $1.50 fee. How are you going to collect that?

Mr. MOTT. I don't think we are going to collect a fee at Hot Springs.

Senator BUMPERS. Well, according to the list I have you are.

Mr. MOTT. I think we have revised that list.

Senator BUMPERS. I trust I can just scrub that out of my mind and not have to worry about that anymore.

Mr. MOTT. Senator, we applied a formula to come to some decision on this and then we reviewed it with the field forces to find out where those parks were where we were charging a fee or we were charging too small a fee because of the local fee system and so forth, and that list has been revised.

At Hot Springs there is no way that we can collect a fee.

Senator BUMPERS. I appreciate that. Let me say that I am reluctant to even raise the question. It is absolutely impractical to talk about charging a fee in Hot Springs. You might charge to go into the visitor center, but that would be rather unique, too, wouldn't it, to charge just to walk into a visitor center.

Mr. MOTT. Right.

Senator BUMPERS. Of course you have been very helpful to me in some of my efforts to try to get some money for that restoration project down there. We want to do our part, but I just don't see how it is practical.

Mr. MOTT. It is not practical. And in our revised list, Hot Springs is not included. There are a number of other areas that we have to review to make sure that it is practical to collect the fees and that it is going to be cost-effective to do so.

Senator **Bumpers**. What do you foresee as the earliest possible time this legislation will be put in place? Are you going to start charging those fees this year?

Mr. **Mott**. No; I would expect that this would go into effect so that we can start January 1, 1987, and so that we can get out the publicity and the educational information necessary so that people will understand what we are doing.

Senator **Bumpers**. Do you agree that your $40 Golden Eagle Pass doesn't have a prayer?

Mr. **Mott**. That is the Golden Eagle doesn't have a prayer?

Senator **Bumpers**. The Golden Eagles are fighting, but this one has no chance.

Mr. **Mott**. I see. Well, it is up to the Congress to decide what that fee should be.

Senator **Bumpers**. Honestly, Bill, don't you think $40 is pretty outrageous for that pass?

Mr. **Mott**. I think that we would be willing to accept the recommendation of Congress in that regard. [Laughter.]

Senator **Bumpers**. Magnanimity is your strong suit, I can see that.

Mr. **Horn**. Let me add two observations on the Golden Eagle question. No. 1, one of the places we got $40 is that is what Director Mott charged for the Golden Bear Pass for the annual pass in the parks in the State of California and it seemed to be accepted there and we always figure California is trend-setting.

Second, if the Golden Eagle were to be dropped from $40 to, let's say, $25, that would cost us approximately $1.8 million in revenue.

Senator **Bumpers**. How many Golden Eagle passes are you selling a year now?

Mr. **Horn**. 100,000.

Senator **Bumpers**. So, you are now collecting $1 million.

Mr. **Horn**. Yes.

Senator **Bumpers**. Are you assuming that you will sell as many in the future at $40 as you are now selling at $10?

Mr. **Horn**. Frankly, right now, when you can go to half these parks for $2 or no cost whatsoever and——

Senator **Bumpers**. Well, just answer the question. I understand that.

Mr. **Horn**. I just do not think that right now there is a great incentive to buy a Golden Eagle Pass because you can go to most of these parks——

Senator **Bumpers**. Because it is too cheap?

Mr. **Horn**. It is a token fee. And to go to the hassle to buy a $10 pass when you can go to Yellowstone and all these places for a couple of bucks a crack, why go to the hassle to buy it? Whereas, when you are looking at a series of parks at $10 per vehicle for a week, and you are going to take a tour of the great Western parks or Shenandoah and the Smokies, it is going to pay you now to go out and buy the Golden Eagle Pass.

Senator **Bumpers**. You know, one time when I was a poor fledgling country lawyer—and I mean pretty poor—I considered taking my family of five on a trip to do nothing but just visit national parks.

Now, today, if I were still a poor fledgling country lawyer, I would dismiss that from my mind, I think, because I would not want to pay $200 for one of those Golden Eagle Passes. I think I could probably go cheaper if I were going to go to——

Senator **Wallop**. It would only be $40 you would have to pay, Senator.

Senator **Bumpers**. Is it $40 for a car?

Senator **Wallop**. Yes.

Mr. **Mott**. Or a carload, and you can stay in the park for 1 whole week. You don't pay any extra.

Senator **Bumpers**. That makes it much more palatable. I thought you were talking about $40 a person. Is it $10 a car now?

Senator **Wallop**. No, $2 now.

Senator **Bumpers**. For a Golden Eagle Pass?

Mr. **Horn**. $10.

Senator **Bumpers**. $10 per car for a Golden Eagle Pass?

Mr. **Horn**. Correct.

Senator **Bumpers**. So, I could take my whole family then for $40.

Senator **Wallop**. No, $10.

Senator **Bumpers**. Well, now.

Senator **Wallop**. Yes.

Senator **Bingaman**. I have to admit, that is a pretty good bargain. [Laughter.]

Senator **Bumpers**. Are you sure $40 is enough? [Laughter.]

Mr. **Horn**. We will defer to the good judgment of Congress.

Mr. **Mott**. Maybe you noticed that we are also increasing the Golden Age Passport—the senior citizens pass—which is now free, and we give out 350,000 of those. I have talked to a lot of senior citizens and I have been to some of the campgrounds where they have their trailers and motor homes, and I am satisfied that charging for the senior citizen pass will be accepted, provided that money goes to the National Park Service.

And you may want to increase that.

Senator **Bumpers**. How much are you proposing to charge seniors?

Mr. **Mott**. $10. And that is for their lifetime.

Senator **Bumpers**. $10 for a lifetime?

Mr. **Mott**. Yes. That is pretty reasonable. But it is now zero, so if you would like to change that upward, we would be glad to have you do so.

Senator **Wallop**. It depends on how long you live, how reasonable.

Senator **Bumpers**. Just a second, Mr. Chairman, if you will.

[Pause.]

Senator **Bumpers**. Staff tells me that the Cumberland Island National Seashore concessionaire there charges $8 for round-trip passage to the seashore. Now, you are proposing to add an additional $5 per vehicle to that.

In calculating that fee, did you know or understand or care that these people have to pay $8 to the concessionaire to get to the seashore?

Mr. **Mott**. On Cumberland Island?

Senator **Bumpers**. Yes.

Mr. **Mott**. We thought that there should be a charge there. On Fort Sumter, where they have to pay for transportation over, we would not make a charge.

These are the things that we are reviewing to make sure that we are not double-charging people in connection with their opportunity to go to one of the units of the National Park System.

We are reviewing that and we have indicated to the chairman, before you came in, Senator, that we would provide a schedule to the committee of what we think now would be the proper way to charge.

Senator **Bumpers**. Bill, did you all have some kind of criteria, set of rules, that you used in setting these fees?

Mr. **Mott**. Yes. We used the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act criteria for setting fees.

Senator **Wallop**. I just asked about that.

Senator **Bumpers**. Have you already been through this? I will not go through that again, then.

What is the policy now on land acquisitions and the construction or the development of new parks?

Mr. **Mott**. The Secretary has made arrangements for the acquisition of new areas. The moratorium that had been imposed in the past does not exist at the present time and we are now working on the Tall Grass Prairie down in Oklahoma to acquire that property, and we are looking at other possibilities for acquisition.

Senator **Bumpers**. Could you furnish this committee with a list of those possibilities that you are looking at?

Mr. **Horn**. I think, Mr. Chairman, the two primary ones right now, on which there have been discussions, involve Tall Grass Prairie and we have been working, of course, with the Nevada delegation involving a proposed great basin unit in Nevada.

Those are the only two totally new units. Then, of course, we have some land acquisition money, plus we are working on a fair number of land exchanges to see if that is a way to acquire some needed lands in an off-budget fashion.

Senator **Bumpers**. How many acquisitions do you have in the pipelines in dollars, estimated cost?

Mr. **Horn**. It is in the multiple millions.

Senator **Bumpers**. Well, it was close to $1 billion when James Watt was Secretary.

Senator **Wallop**. No, it was more.

Senator **Bumpers**. Was it more than that?

Senator **Wallop**. Yes. A couple of billion.

Senator **Bumpers**. Maybe $2 billion.

Mr. **Horn**. If the question is in terms of what is the outstanding cost to acquire all of the inholdings in all of the national parks, that does exceed $1 billion dollars.

Senator **Bumpers**. That does exceed what?

Mr. **Horn**. One billion, particularly when you include areas like Redwoods.

Senator **Bumpers**. How much did you spend last year toward land acquisition?

Mr. Horn. Last year the appropriated sum of money in fiscal year 1985 was somewhere around $40 or $50 million. But I would have to go back and double-check the appropriated sums.

[The information follows:]

The Congressional appropriation for land acquisition for the National Park Service in fiscal 1986, adjusted for Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and overall congressional reductions, was $46,041,000.

Senator Bumpers. Why would it not be a good idea to take a bigger percentage of this fee increase and put it into that fund? The prices for what you are going to buy just continue to escalate every year. I promise you that if you only spent $40 or $50 million last year, you were standing still, because the increased cost of what remains probably went up that much or more.

Mr. Horn. In our mind, the people are paying to go into a park and I think it is appropriate therefore, that since it is an entrance fee, it be used to run those parks, and that is why we would like to make the tie to the operations and maintenance.

We would be more than pleased to look at and work with Congress, and I know we are working with the President's Commission on American Outdoors on alternative ways to fund not only recreation programs but land acquisition programs. Of course, you know, we have the classic example on the other side of the Department with the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Duck Stamp Program, where we have a stamp that goes totally to land acquisition purposes.

But I think in this particular case, you are paying an entrance fee. I think the obligation is to have that money go back to run those parks and make them a better place to visit, instead of buying new areas.

Senator Bumpers. Do we have your assurance, Mr. Mott, that if we approved increased fees to the tune of $40, $50, $60 million a year, that you will not try to reduce the budget by that amount?

Mr. Mott. That is correct. I think that our feeling is that this money is to be used for the interpretation, research, and resource management. Those are the areas that are critical to the National Park Service, so that we can turn over units of the National Park Service to future generations unimpaired, and we need that money for that purpose.

I think that the question of land acquisition funding has to come from appropriations by Congress.

Senator Bumpers. I thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I may have three or four questions that I want to submit for the record.

Senator Wallop. Thank you, Dale.

Thank you both very much. Appreciate it.

Let me just add one last piece of anxiety. We have a June 10 memo which we sent to members of the committee with regards to this hearing and these two bills. In there we have your latest submission to us, parks that are going to have fees and fees that are going to be charged. If Senator Bumpers was curious about Hot Springs, it is because it is on the list, the latest thing we have.

It goes back to the same sort of problem that I expressed this morning. It is very hard for this committee to deal with issues that are so politically sensitive as this without having them more sensitive.

[The list follows:]

New list 6/25

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PROPOSED ENTRANCE FEE AREAS--BY FEE AMOUNT

	PARK	REG	VISITS 85	VEHICLES 85	85 FEE	85 ENT REVENUE	87 FEE	FEE TYPE PERS	VEH	87 REVENUE
1	BIG BEND NP	SW	188,045	58,764	$0.00	$0	$10.00		1	$235,056
2	EVERGLADES NP	SE	697,646	218,014	$2.00	$162,223	$10.00		1	$872,058
3	GLACIER NP	RM	1,603,011	500,941	$2.00	$195,731	$10.00		1	$782,924
4	GRAND CANYON NP	W	2,711,529	847,353	$2.00	$896,652	$10.00		1	$3,389,411
5	GRAND TETON NP	RM	1,334,483	417,026	$2.00	$265,739	$10.00		1	$1,062,956
6	MESA VERDE NP	RM	656,271	205,085	$2.00	$184,086	$10.00		1	$820,339
7	MOUNT RANIER NP	PNW	1,165,640	364,263	$2.00	$257,231	$10.00		1	$1,457,050
8	ROCKY MOUNTAIN NP	RM	2,248,854	702,767	$2.00	$119,747	$10.00		1	$478,988
9	YELLOWSTONE NP	RM	2,226,159	695,675	$2.00	$487,127	$10.00		1	$1,948,508
10	YOSEMITE NP	WR	2,831,952	884,985	$3.00	$1,456,847	$10.00		1	$3,539,940
			15,663,590			4,025,383				14,587,230
			14.5%			56.7%				28.2%
1	ACADIA NP *	NA	3,745,570	1,170,491	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$2,060,157
2	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND NS *	MA	2,304,906	720,283	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$440,566
3	BANDELIER NM	SW	238,434	74,511	$1.00	$28,571	$5.00		1	$149,021
4	BRYCE CANYON NP	RM	500,782	156,494	$2.00	$135,783	$5.00		1	$312,989
5	CANYONLANDS NP	RM	541,315	169,161	$1.00	$42,390	$5.00		1	$338,322
6	CAPE COD NS *	NA	4,374,799	1,367,125	$1.00	$135,377	$5.00		1	$541,508
7	COLONIAL NHP *	MA	2,138,188	668,184	$2.00	$110,063	$5.00		1	$220,125
8	COLORADO NM *	RM	319,248	99,765	$1.00	$17,856	$5.00		1	$99,530
9	CRATER LAKE NP	PNW	390,604	122,064	$2.00	$112,817	$5.00		1	$244,128
10	DEATH VALLEY NM	W	576,679	180,212	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$360,424
11	DINOSAUR NM	RM	418,187	130,683	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$261,367
12	FORT LARAMIE NHS	RM	81,531	25,478	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$50,957
13	FORT UNION NM	SW	13,362	4,176	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$8,351
14	HAWAII VOLCANOES NP	W	816,652	255,204	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$510,408
15	ISLE ROYALE NP	MW	16,775	N/A	$0.00	$0	$5.00	1		$33,550
16	JOSHUA TREE NM	W	641,172	200,366	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$400,733
17	LASSEN VOLCANIC NP	W	451,497	141,093	$1.00	$78,931	$5.00		1	$282,186
18	LAVA BEDS NM	W	68,254	21,329	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$42,659
19	PETRIFIED FOREST NP	W	736,659	230,206	$1.00	$125,951	$5.00		1	$460,412
20	PINNACLES NM	W	191,578	59,868	$1.00	$21,636	$5.00		1	$119,736
21	SEQUOIA/KINGS CANYON NP	W	1,813,924	566,851	$2.00	$328,121	$5.00		1	$656,242
22	SHENANDOAH NP	MA	1,933,085	604,089	$2.00	$645,528	$5.00		1	$1,208,178
23	THEODORE ROOSEVELT NP *	RM	377,152	117,860	$1.00	$18,540	$5.00		1	$135,720
24	ZION NP	RM	1,503,272	469,773	$2.00	$245,022	$5.00		1	$939,545
			24,193,625			2,046,586				9,876,812
			22.4%			28.8%				19.1%
1	AGATE FOSSIL BEDS NM	MW	10,366	3,239	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$3,887
2	ALLEGEHENY PORTAGE RAILROAD NHS	MA	69,523	21,726	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$26,071
3	ANDERSONVILLE NHS	SE	118,440	37,013	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$44,415
4	AZTEC RUINS NM	SW	58,187	18,183	$1.00	$12,702	$3.00		1	$21,820
5	BADLANDS NP	RM	950,242	296,951	$1.00	$94,198	$3.00		1	$356,341
6	BLACK CANYON OF THE GUNNISON NM	RM	266,012	83,129	$1.00	$26,698	$3.00		1	$99,755
7	CABRILLO NM	W	1,652,089	516,278	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$619,533
8	CANAVERAL NS	SE	31,769	9,928	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$11,913
9	CANYON DE CHELLY NM	SW	452,286	141,339	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$169,607
10	CAPE HATTERAS NS	SE	1,224,687	382,715	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$459,258
11	CAPITOL REEF NP	RM	320,503	100,157	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$120,189
12	CAPULIN MOUNTAIN NM	SW	43,810	13,691	$1.00	$9,350	$3.00		1	$16,429
13	CASA GRANDE NM	W	142,252	44,454	$1.00	$25,504	$3.00		1	$53,345
14	CEDAR BREAKS NM	RM	385,381	120,432	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$144,518
15	CHIRACAHUA NM	W	61,680	19,275	$1.00	$10,430	$3.00		1	$23,130
16	CORONADO N MEM	W	44,026	13,758	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$16,510
17	COWPENS NB	SE	79,372	24,804	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$29,765
18	CRATERS OF THE MOON NM	PNW	172,503	53,907	$1.00	$10,890	$3.00		1	$64,689
19	CUMBERLAND GAP NHS	SE	729,685	228,027	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$273,632
20	CUSTER BATTLEFIELD NM	RM	261,686	81,777	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$98,132
21	DEVILS POSTPILE NM	W	108,678	33,962	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$40,754
22	DEVILS TOWER NM	RM	216,787	67,746	$1.00	$41,126	$3.00		1	$81,295
23	FLORISSANT FOSSIL BEDS NM	RM	93,990	29,372	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$35,246
24	FORT DAVIS NHS	SW	68,410	21,378	$1.00	$10,793	$3.00		1	$25,654
25	FORT DONELSON NMP	SE	300,404	93,876	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$112,652
26	FORT RALEIGH NHS	SE	272,832	85,260	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$102,312
27	FORT WASHINGTON	NC	367,587	114,871	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$137,845
28	GREAT FALLS PARK (GWMP)	NC	250,000	78,125	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$93,750
29	GREAT SAND DUNES NM	RM	182,713	57,098	$1.00	$39,843	$3.00		1	$68,517
30	GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NP	SW	147,758	46,174	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$55,409
31	GUILFORD COURTHOUSE NMP	SE	179,278	56,024	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$67,229

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PROPOSED ENTRANCE FEE AREAS--BY FEE AMOUNT

PARK	REG	VISITS 85	VEHICLES 85	85 FEE	85 ENT REVENUE	87 FEE	FEE TYPE PERS	FEE TYPE VEH	87 REVENUE
32 GULF ISLANDS NS *	SE	9,880,814	3,087,754	$1.00	$93,752	$3.00		1	$225,005
33 HALEAKALA NP	W	1,194,651	373,328	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$447,994
34 HOPEWELL FURNACE NHS	MA	154,027	48,133	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$57,760
35 MONTEZUMA CASTLE NM	W	545,624	170,508	$1.00	$86,644	$3.00		1	$204,609
36 OLYMPIC NP *	PNW	2,532,145	791,295	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$474,777
37 ORGAN PIPE CACTUS NM	W	175,581	54,869	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$65.843
38 PADRE ISLAND NS	SW	669,078	209,087	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$250,904
39 PIPE SPRING NM	RM	30,083	9,401	$0.50	$5,155	$3.00	1		$11.281
40 PIPESTONE NM	MW	131,204	41,001	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$49.202
41 SAGUARO NM	W	636,711	198,972	$0.00		$3.00		1	$238,767
42 SCOTTS BLUFF NM	MW	168,616	52,693	$1.00	$10,933	$3.00		1	$63,231
43 TONTO NM	W	73.606	23.002	$1.00	$6,297	$3.00		1	$27,602
44 TUMACACORI NM	W	58.022	18,132	$1.00	$10,776	$3.00		1	$21.758
45 TUZIGOOT NM	W	90.934	28,417	$1.00	$15,728	$3.00		1	$34.100
46 WALNUT CANYON NM	W	90.077	28,149	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$33,779
47 WHITE SANDS NM	SW	486.754	152,111	$1.00	$78,491	$3.00		1	$182,533
48 WIND CAVE NP	RM	466.585	145,808	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$174,969
49 WUPATKI-SUNSET CRATER NM	W	191,950	59,984	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$71,981
		------------			-----------				------------
		26,839.398			589,310				6,109.696
		24.9%			8.3%				11.8%
1 ADAMS NHS	NA	24,555	N\A	$0.50	$5,237	$2.50	1		$24,555
2 APOSTLE ISLANDS NL	MW	117.353	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$117,353
3 CHACO CULTURE NHP	SW	43.133	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$43,133
4 CUMBERLAND ISLAND NS	SE	30,077	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$18,046
5 EDISON NHS	NA	32.599	N/A	$0.50	$7,144	$2.50	1		$32,599
6 FREDERICK LAW OLMSTEAD NHS	NA	3,457	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$3.457
7 GOLDEN SPIKE NHS	RM	46.387	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$46,387
8 GRANT-KOHRS RANCH NHS	RM	23.166	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$23,166
9 HARPERS FERRY NHP	NC	566,661	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$566.661
10 HOME OF FRANKLIN D ROOSEVELT NHS	NA	214,011	N/A	$1.50	$0	$2.50	1		$128.407
11 INDEPENDENCE NHP *	MA	4,867,399	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$2,433,699
12 JOHN MUIR HOUSE NHS	W	33,954	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$33,954
13 LONGFELLOW NHS	NA	19,186	N/A	$0.50	$6,362	$2.50	1		$19,186
14 LOWELL NHP	NA	706,921	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$706,921
15 LYNDON B JOHNSON NHP	SW	287,622	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$287,622
16 SAINT-GAUDENS NHS	NA	31,880	N/A	$0.50	$4,536	$2.50	1		$31,880
		------------			-----------				------------
		7,048,361			23,279				4,517,026
		6.5%			0.3%				8.7%
1 ANDREW JOHNSON NHS	SE	68.607	N/A	$0.50	$2,318	$1.50	1		$41,164
2 ANTIETAM NB	NC	585.190	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$351.114
3 APPOMATTOX COURTHOUSE NHP	MA	277,613	86,754	$1.00	$25,157	$1.50	1		$52,052
4 ARKANSAS POST NMEM	SW	55,113	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$33.066
5 ARLINGTON HOUSE-ROBT. E. LEE NMEM	NC	496,848	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$298.109
6 BENT'S OLD FORT NHS	RM	42,875	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$25,725
7 BIG HOLE NB	RM	34,603	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$20.762
8 BOOKER T WASHINGTON NM	MA	19.644	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$11,786
9 BOSTON NHP	NA	1,560,527	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$936.316
10 BUCK ISLAND REEF NM	SE	62,345	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$37,407
11 CAPE LOOKOUT NS	SE	100,380	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$60,228
12 CARL SANDBURG HOME NHS	SE	53,689	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$32,213
13 CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NM	SE	1,033,048	N/A	$0.50	$207,109	$1.50	1		$619,829
14 CASTLE CLINTON NM	NA	128,012	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$76,807
15 CHICKAMAUGA/CHATTANOOGA NMP *	SE	1,075,504	N/A	$0.50	$9,269	$1.50	1		$426,302
16 CHRISTIANSTED NHS	SE	133,603	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$80,162
17 CLARA BARTON NHS	NC	17,315	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$10,389
18 DE SOTO N MEM	SE	201,869	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$121,121
19 EDGAR ALLEN POE NHS	MA	15,254	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$9,152
20 EFFIGY MOUNDS NM	MW	93,074	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$55,844
21 EISENHOWER NHS	MA	136,935	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$82,161
22 EL MORRO NM	SW	47,299	N/A	$1.00	$5,574	$1.50	1		$28,379
23 ELEANOR ROOSEVELT NHS	NA	30,712	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$18,427
24 FORD'S THEATRE NHS *	NC	769,780	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$304,833
25 FORT CAROLINE NMEM	SE	164,145	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$98,487
26 FORT CLATSOP NMEM	PNW	159,861	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$95,917
27 FORT FREDERICA NM	SE	231,010	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$138,606
28 FORT LARNED NHS	MW	58,625	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$35,175
29 FORT McHENRY NM & HISTORIC SHRINE	MA	795,752	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$477,451
30 FORT NECESSITY NB	MA	140,199	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$84,119
31 FORT PULASKI NM	SE	381,616	N/A	$1.00	$18,362	$1.50	1		$22,034

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PROPOSED ENTRANCE FEE AREAS--BY FEE AMOUNT

	PARK	REG	VISITS 85	VEHICLES 85	85 FEE	85 ENT REVENUE	87 FEE	FEE TYPE PERS	VEH	87 REVENUE
32	FORT SCOTT NHS	MW	76,193	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$45,716
33	FORT SMITH NHS	SW	138,410	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$83,046
34	FORT STANWIX NM	MA	67,100	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$40,260
35	FORT VANCOUVER NHS	PNW	264,829	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$158,897
36	FREDERICKSBURG/SPOTSYLVANIA NMP	MA	240,932	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$144,559
37	FRIENDSHIP HILL NHS	MA	13,620	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$8,172
38	GEORGE ROGERS CLARK NHP	MW	121,555	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$72,933
39	GEORGE WASHINGTON BIRTHPLACE NM	MA	150,515	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$90,309
40	GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NM	MW	137,117	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$82,270
41	GETTYSBURG NMP	MA	1,321,130	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$792,678
42	GRAND PORTAGE NM	MW	46,488	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$27,893
43	HAMPTON MANSION NHS	MA	69,970	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$41,982
44	HARRY S TRUMAN NHS	MW	114,686	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$68,812
45	HERBERT HOOVER NHS	MW	207,845	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$124,707
46	HOMESTEAD NM OF AMERICA	MW	21,268	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$12,761
47	HORSESHOE BEND NMP	SE	62,549	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$37,529
48	JEFFERSON NAT'L EXPANS.MEM NHS *	MW	2,140,316	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$642,095
49	JOHN DAY FOSSIL BEDS	PNW	101,566	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$60,940
50	JOHN F KENNEDY NHS	NA	17,438	N/A	$0.50	$4,382	$1.50	1		$10,463
51	KENNESAW MOUNTAIN NBP	SE	776,340	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$465,804
52	KINGS MOUNTAIN NMP	SE	212,605	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$127,563
53	LINCOLN BOYHOOD NMEM	MW	219,215	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$131,529
54	LINCOLN HOME NHS	MW	431,347	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$258,808
55	MANASSAS NBP	NC	723,998	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$434,399
56	MARTIN VAN BUREN NHS	NA	5,335	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$5,335
57	MINUTE MAN NHP *	NA	895,775	N/A	$0.75	$2,381	$1.50	1		$268,733
58	MOORES CREEK NB	SE	35,000	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$21,000
59	MORRISTOWN NHP *	NA	620,809	N/A	$0.50	$14,218	$1.50	1		$186,243
60	MOUND CITY GROUP NM	MW	39,632	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$23,779
61	NEZ PERCE NHP	PNW	228,300	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$136,980
62	OCMULGEE NM	SE	198,596	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$119,158
63	PEA RIDGE NMP	SW	118,613	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$71,168
64	PECOS NM	SW	44,616	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$26,770
65	PERRY'S VICTORY & INT'L PEACE MEM	MW	154,893	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$92,936
66	PETERSBURG NB	MA	526,073	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$315,644
67	PICTURED ROCKS NL	MW	397,884	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$238,730
68	PUUHONUA O HONAUNAU NHP	W	394,844	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$236,906
69	RICHMOND NBP	MA	305,667	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$183,400
70	ROGER WILLIAMS NMEM	NA	14,480	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$8,688
71	RUSSELL CAVE NM	SE	21,561	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$12,937
72	SAGAMORE HILL NHS	NA	121,598	N/A	$0.50	$23,419	$1.50	1		$72,959
73	SALEM MARITIME NHS	NA	669,983	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$401,990
74	SALINAS NM	SW	29,643	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$17,786
75	SAN JUAN ISLAND NHP	PNW	104,312	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$62,587
76	SAN JUAN NHS *	SE	2,221,661	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$666,498
77	SARATOGA NHP	NA	116,922	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$70,153
78	SAUGUS IRON WORKS NHS	NA	40,320	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$24,192
79	SHILOH NMP	SE	264,428	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$158,657
80	SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NL	MW	897,512	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$538,507
81	SPRINGFIELD ARMORY NHS	NA	16,123	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$9,674
82	STATUE OF LIBERTY NM	NA	190,172	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$114,103
83	STONES RIVER NB	SE	196,299	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$117,779
84	THEODORE ROOSEVELT BIRTHPLACE NHS	NA	17,511	N/A	$0.50		$1.50	1		$10,507
85	THEODORE ROOSEVELT INAUGURAL NHS	NA	12,416	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$7,450
86	TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE NHS	SE	96,655	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$57,993
87	USS ARIZONA MEMORIAL	W	1,174,573	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$704,744
88	VALLEY FORGE NHP *	MA	4,177,029	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$1,253,109
89	VANDERBILT MANSION NHS	NA	324,128	N/A	$1.50	$99,053	$1.50	1		$99,053
90	VICKSBURG NMP	SE	899,674	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$539,804
91	WASHINGTON MONUMENT	NC	1,229,062	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$737,437
92	WHITMAN MISSION NHS	PNW	104,050	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$62,430
93	WILSON'S CREEK NB	MW	176,821	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$106,093
94	WOMAN'S RIGHTS NHP	NA	14,755	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$8,853
95	WRIGHT BROTHERS N MEM	SE	448,677	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$269,206
			34,194,481 31.7%			411,242 5.8%				16,709,236 32.3%
194	TOTALS		107,939,455	20,924,203		$7,095,800				$51,800,000

Mr. **Mott**. Mr. Chairman, I think the problem is that we have been checking with our field to find out what they thought about the fee schedules as we have established them and we had gotten the information back last week and we now have a revised fee schedule which we will make available to you.

Senator **Wallop**. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

Senator **Bumpers**. I must confess, Mr. Chairman, the list I had is dated February 11.

Senator **Wallop**. But this was the latest submission that we had from which to conduct the hearing. So, you were perfectly correct in raising the point.

Thank you.

Next Mr. Bill Reilly, president of the Conservation Foundation, accompanied by Mr. Michael Mantell, senior associate; and Mr. Paul Pritchard, president, National Parks and Conservation Association

Bill, the last time I saw you, you didn't see me. You were on a soapbox in the Denver Airport, standing in front of a tortoise.

Mr. **Reilly**. I was indeed, Senator. I had not realized you were there that day and would have invited you to make a few remarks about endangered species.

Senator **Wallop**. That is why I was frightened to come down there.

Mr. **Reilly**. Well, you were quite right.

Senator **Wallop**. Please proceed, if you would.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM K. REILLY, PRESIDENT, THE CONSERVATION FOUNDATION; ACCOMPANIED BY MICHAEL MANTELL, SENIOR ASSOCIATE, THE CONSERVATION FOUNDATION

Mr. **Reilly**. Thank you, sir.

I would like to say how pleased I am to see these hearings——

Senator **Wallop**. Bill, could you suspend for just a minute until we get some of these folks out of the room so that we can hear up here?

Thank you.

Mr. **Reilly**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am joined here, as you said, by Michael Mantell who is an attorney, a senior associate at the Conservation Foundation, who is one of the five senior people who participated in the development of the Conservation Foundation's report last year.

Senator **Wallop**. Can I just make an observation before you go on? It is no wonder we have such an expensive Park Service. Do you see how little there is in the room after they have left? [Laughter.]

I don't know how much staff is necessary to listen to me ask questions or the Director to testify.

Mr. **Reilly**. I wish I were a better draw. I could have kept them around.

Well, let me say again how much I appreciate your holding these hearings and the priority you have given the consideration of these bills, and particularly S. 2130 which is based on a report that the Conservation Foundation released last year and which you also scheduled hearings on at that time.

I have a 15-page statement. With your permission I would like to ask that that be inserted in the record and I will summarize.

Senator WALLOP. By all means. And I appreciate that.

Mr. REILLY. The report, "National Parks for a New Generation," was something that we devoted a great deal of resources and attention to. It took 3 years to develop. It was funded by the Richard King Mellon Foundation. It involved site visits to 165 parks and it involved a great deal of research and analysis.

That report was the third in a series that the Conservation Foundation has conducted beginning back in 1969 and we concluded in that report, as in the others, that the National Park System is a great American success story. It represents an inspiring ideal, but it also represents a very practical achievement of government, of the American people.

Americans quite clearly love their parks. And this affection and regard provides a very strong underpinning for efforts to conserve and protect the parks. Polls attest that the people love the parks and deeply respect the Park Service. The Park Service in our opinion is as well led and staffed as at any time in the past, which is saying a great deal.

So I am not here to suggest that there is a situation in which the parks are falling into ruin or chaos, or that it is 1 minute to midnight with respect to the parks.

I do want to say that our study alerted us to severe concerns about the conditions, serious concerns about the condition of park natural resources and cultural resources. I think the evidence of these problems comes from many sources. It is supported by our own report, but it is also supported by the State of the Parks Report conducted in 1980, and by more recent reports from superintendents, resource management plans, and from the regions.

A principal recommendation in our report to address these resource protection needs is what we call "Preservation 95." It would enable the Park Service to address the most pressing resource needs in a way that we think is systematic and pragmatic. It would enable the Park Service to train a larger cadre of specialists, of qualified people who can evaluate and interpret resources and then manage them and, I think most important of all with reference to this legislation, it would institutionalize the Congress and the Park Service to commitment to resource conservation.

I mentioned the facts about resource problems are well documented. A recent survey of Park Service regional offices identified a backlog of $234 million in natural resource projects needing to be carried out in the next 5 years.

There are similar amounts discussed as necessary over the same period for cultural resources. You have a list of those priority projects, and they are broken down State by State. They range from monitoring and improving water quality in Grand Teton National Park where sewage contamination is suspected, to stabilizing and revegetating areas in Mount Rainier in Washington where sewage contamination is suspected, to stabilizing and revegetating areas in Mount Ranier in Washington.

The regions have also identified equally serious cultural resource problems. The Thomas A. Edison home in New Jersey needs a fire suppression system to be modernized. There is a need to stabilize

13 sites at Chaco Culture in New Mexico and a need for an archeological survey at the Buffalo River in Arkansas.

Well, these are only the regions list and those projects, that list, is culled down from lists submitted by the superintendents and contained in the resource management plans which have about twice as many of these projects.

So it is not just a wish list. There has already been some discrimination, some judgment, some analysis applied to it.

Our study left us with a concern about the capability of the National Park Service to evaluate and to interpret and to manage natural and cultural resources, particularly at a time when there is a rapid improvement in scientific understanding of natural systems and when public demand for authenticity in our parks has probably never been higher.

There are 337 units in the National Park System. There are, by contrast, only 70 scientists on the staff, that is, seven-tenths of 1 percent of the total Park Service staff. The Fish and Wildlife Service has 650 scientists. The Forest Service has 2,100 by contrast.

The Service has identified a need for 190 natural resource specialists—this is the National Park Service regional survey—specialists in wildlife management, in biology, in museum curating, and in architectural preservation.

There is, at the moment, in the outstanding wildlife park in the system, the Denali National Park, not a single wildlife biologist on staff is able to study and explain why there have been decreases in wildlife observed in that park adjacent to the road in the last couple of years.

There are insufficient funds currently even to monitor park water quality in the Grand Teton National Park. The Park Service has a tradition of generalists staff members. It is a good tradition. It has generally served them well, but in our view it very seriously needs supplementing.

The Park Service has not given the priority to this that it might, that we think it should. Training in natural and cultural resources management is not mandatory in the Park Service. It is offered less frequently than training in any number of other areas, and as a result I think the management is necessarily often ad hoc.

S. 2130 promises a congressional and Park Service commitment to better managing and interpreting national and cultural resources. It promises to restore damaged resources at 100 most critical natural and cultural resource projects. It promises to improve research and monitoring by addressing 100 most important research and monitoring projects identified each year.

It also promises to train more qualified individuals at the rate of about 35 per year over each of the next 5 years in some of the disciplines I just described.

Finally, it provides for more effective planning of resources, of evaluating measures taken, and of reporting to Congress in a biennial assessment of systemwide resource conditions and trends.

Now, it is a 10-year program. It would bring about, I think, a sense of urgency and commitment. It would provide long-term stability and expectations to Park Service planners and superintendents. It is very much in the tradition of significant ventures in the past on the part of the Service. One thinks of Mission 66 which was developed, $1 billion or so in the 1950's, as visitor rates began to soar in the National Parks; the Park Restoration and Improvement Program, the PRIP Program which was approved in 1981 also is one of these examples, and I might point out that that involved the expenditure of $1 billion over 5 years to improve visitors's facilities. That is twice the amount, over half the time, of what is proposed in S. 2130. And that measure was adopted at a period when, if anything, the economic difficulties confronting the United States were more serious than they are today.

There is a proposal in S. 2130 for a modest increase in park entrance fees and that increase would be fully allocated to protection and management of resources, cultural and natural, and to training in some of these specialties.

I might say that as conservationists, I think we come warily to propose any fee increases at all. We do so with considerable soul-searching, and I think we are moved to do so now because of the urgency of the needs of resource management and protection and because of the special nature of the budgetary situation the Nation confronts.

But I would like to underscore that in our view, this bill, S. 2130, is not about fees; it is about conservation. It is about maintenance, protection, restoration of natural and cultural resources.

Wallace Stegner has written that the National Parks truly speak to what is best in our country. I think they represent our ideals, the best of our landscapes, our natural systems and wonders, our cultural shrines, nature conserved, accessible and uplifting.

I believe that S. 2130 is a modest investment in responsible stewardship of the best natural and cultural resources this country has.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Reilly follows:]

The Conservation Foundation

Testimony of William K. Reilly
President of The Conservation Foundation
before the
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Reserved Water,
and Resource Conservation
of the
Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
June 12, 1986

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am William K. Reilly, President of The Conservation Foundation, a nonprofit environmental research organization. I am pleased to be here today to speak about the needs of the National Park System, particularly the outstanding natural and cultural resources that make our Park System what it is--something Americans from all walks of life treasure. I want to comment specifically on Senate Bill 2130, introduced by Senator Dave Durenberger and co-sponsored by several other distinguished members of the Senate.

You are to be commended, Mr. Chairman, on your leadership and your willingness to consider the special needs of National Park resources and the approach embodied in Senate Bill 2130 to protect and revitalize them.

1255 Twenty-Third Street NW
Washington, DC 20037
202/293-4800 Telex 64505 PANDA

Affiliated with World Wildlife Fund

As you know, the research supporting the approach made in Senate Bill 2130 is found in The Conservation Foundation's 1985 report, National Parks for a New Generation: Visions, Realities, Prospects, generously supported by the Richard King Mellon Foundation. This report is a far-reaching examination of the future of the National Park System. We were grateful for the hearings this Subcommittee held on that report last July and for the strong endorsement by many Senators and by National Park Service Director Mott of the principal findings and recommendations we made.

One of the central messages of National Parks for a New Generation is that even in the 1980s, with tremendous cutbacks in domestic programs and skepticism in some quarters about the ability of government to meet future needs, the national parks continue to shine as a great American success story. The National Park System is something in which we can take tremendous pride. It celebrates the diversity of American life and history. Today the parks provide experiences that are more and more difficult to come by in our increasingly populated, industrialized, and urbanized world.

The parks, as Wallace Stegner has observed, truly speak to what is best about our country. The concept, which originated in Yellowstone in 1872, has been exported in various forms to over 100 countries throughout the world--something I have become much more aware of in my new role as President of both the World Wildlife Fund and The Conservation Foundation, which affiliated last fall.

By all projections the love affair Americans--indeed people from all over--have with our parks will result this summer in the highest number of visitors ever to the National Park System. Because of their success, the parks generate an enormous wellspring of support and enthusiasm across the country. These provide valuable opportunities to protect the parks and build on their legacy. It is this success and regard that we need to maintain and build on, even in these times of severe budgetary constraints, so that current and future generations can enjoy the wonders of the parks.

In conducting our study of National Parks, we became deeply concerned about the condition of park natural and cultural resources. We became concerned about their ability to maintain preeminence, especially in light of the increasing pressures they face from a variety of sources and the relative lack of attention they have received. A principal finding of the report was the need for a 10-year program--we called it Preservation '95--to enable the Park Service to address the most pressing resource needs in a systematic and pragmatic fashion, to train a larger cadre of qualified people to manage and interpret them effectively, and to institutionalize resources management higher among National Park Service priorities.

Thus, I want to stress with you this morning three points, each of which is addressed in the proposed National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986 (or Senate Bill 2130):

o park resources are under severe stress, and there is a need to improve Park Service capability in managing them;

- a new program is essential to preserve, revitalize, and maintain resources effectively; and
- funds are available to realize the goals of the program.

The Condition of Park Resources

Despite the magnificence of the parks and the image of fine stewardship enjoyed by the Park Service, the Foundation's report concluded that there is justifiable concern about the condition of and pressures on park resources. In initiating the study, quite frankly, we wanted to review carefully the degree of stress and deteriorated conditions that had been previously reported. Given the spectacular nature of the resources set aside in the parks, most visitors surely must wonder what all the concern is about.

After three years of research and an indepth look at the condition of park resources, the Foundation concluded that they are under enormous stress. In fact, we concluded that the condition and needs had, in fact, even been understated in some cases. National Parks for a New Generation is filled with examples of diminished park wildlife habitat, of polluted park waters and air, of uncared for and uncatalogued historic objects, of eroding dunes and the lack of knowledge about particular resource conditions. One year later most of these problems still exist.

To be sure, the parks look as wonderful and as majestic as ever to the casual visitor. But from discussion after discussion with park personnel and with experts from outside the Service, as well as one review after another of park documents, any objective source must conclude that concerns about the condition and fate of park resources are entirely valid.

There have been notable strides over the last five years to devote more attention to the condition of park resources. Since 1980, when the Park Service's State of the Parks report documented numerous pressures on park resources, Congress has increased appropriations for resource management, and additional increases in budget and staff for this purpose have been provided under other programs. The National Park Service has identified hundreds of projects to prevent further degradation of natural and cultural resources and to repair or restore those already impaired. The Park Restoration and Improvement Program (PRIP), the $1-billion crash effort undertaken by the Service between 1981 and 1985 to repair aging park facilities and infrastructure, protected some important resources as well.

We particularly commend the recent leadership of Director Mott in focusing attention on the needs of the parks' natural and cultural resources. If carried out, the Action Agenda to the Park Service's 12-Point Plan that he and his staff recently released will continue to foster some important improvements in the management of park resources. Creating usable resource inventories for each park, establishing a "Blue Ribbon Panel" to make recommendations for improving cultural and natural resources management, and integrating research, resource management, interpretation, and public information efforts are items of particular note in the 12-Point Plan Action Agenda.

Despite these advances, however, the evidence of resource problems continues to build. Moreover, practical, cost-effective measures identified by the Park Service to correct problems and to better assess the condition of park resources continue to go unaddressed. The facts speak for themselves:

- A recent survey of the Park Service regional offices to identify the 100 most pressing needs in parks to correct damaged natural resources and to improve research and monitoring of specific types of resources found a backlog of some $234 million worth of projects to be carried out over the next five years. The projects identified, a list of which each of you have for parks in your state, range from monitoring and improving water quality in Grand Teton in Wyoming, where sewage contamination is suspected, to stabilizing and revegetating eroded areas in Mount Rainer in Washington.

- Similar pressing needs have been identified by the regions for repairing damaged cultural resources and for conducting research to better understand their condition. Examples include repairing and upgrading the deteriorated fire-suppression system at the Thomas A. Edison Home in New Jersey, stabilizing 13 sites at Chaco Culture in New Mexico, and conducting an archeological survey at Buffalo River in Arkansas.

- These identified projects are only the tip of the iceberg. They are the priorities ranked by the regions based on submissions by each park. The projects submitted by every park, which appear in park resource management plans, number more than twice as many as the regional list. In each case, these are not wish lists. They only include the highest priority projects, designed to address the most serious problems. Many other needed projects do not even make the regional lists.

The Conservation Foundation's research also leads one to be concerned about the capability of the National Park Service to manage effectively the diverse resources in the System and deal with the pressures they face, especially in this era of rapid scientific advances in understanding natural processes and increasing demands for more authenticity with regard to cultural resources. Again, the facts are convincing that action is urgently needed:

- While the Park System comprises more than 330 units, the Park Service has a total of 70 scientists on staff--approximately seven-tenths of one percent of the total staff! By comparison, the Fish and Wildlife Service has some 650 scientists on staff while the Forest Service has over 2,100 scientists in its ranks.

- The total science budget of the Park Service is reported to be less than the total budget of a single Forest Service Experiment Station. (The Forest Service has 8 such research stations.)
- A recent survey of parks to assess current resource specialist staffing and to determine high priority needs for additional resource management specialists revealed that parks are severly understaffed in both natural and cultural resource management. According to the survey, some 190 natural resource specialists are identified as needed by the parks, with almost 50 percent of this total ranked as high priority. The total needs identified for cultural resources were even higher. People with experience and training in museum curating, archaeology, preservation of architecture, wildlife management, and biology were among the specialties identified as high priority needs by parks throughout the country. Park Service training programs in natural and cultural resources are not mandatory and are offered less frequently than many other programs.

This information is not to suggest that the Park Service should become an ivory-tower research agency filled with specialists in all kinds of disciplines. Nor is it intended that all personnel should be required to spend endless hours of training in natural and cultural resource management. The generalist tradition of the Park Service has stood it well and should continue. Adaptation to contemporary challenges in managing and protecting resources and accommodating visitors is, however, essential.

Solid information and trained personnel are the keys to well-reasoned, effective decision-making--identifying the real problems, their causes, and reasonable solutions. Otherwise, resource management becomes ad hoc and based largely on who complains the most about a particular problem.

The figures on high priority resource projects and staffing needs were compiled within the last three months. They make the case for action even more compelling when coupled with the data the Foundation had available for use in its 1985 report.

A Program to Improve Park Resources

There can be little doubt about the central importance of healthy, well-preserved resources to the parks and the fact that their current condition requires immediate attention. While addressing the identified project and staffing needs through the annual appropriations process has helped to improve the situation, it has not been adequate. What is needed is major Congressional and Park Service commitment to managing and interpreting resources more effectively over time.

What we outlined in National Parks for a New Generation and what is contained in Senate Bill 2130 now before you, is a major new initiative to assure that the protection of park resources receives the attention it deserves. Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, there is an immediate need for a resources counterpart to the facilities-oriented PRIP. The piecemeal approach currently underway does not speak to the primary importance of resources in the parks and to the serious problems confronting them.

The program put forth in the National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986 would address four principal needs over a 10-year period:

- restore damaged resources by addressing the 100 most critical natural and cultural resource projects identified each year;

- improve research and monitoring of resources by addressing the 100 most important research and monitoring projects identified each year;
- train more qualified individuals to manage and interpret park resources;
- provide for more effective planning of resources management, evaluating of the measures taken, and reporting to Congress and the public on their conditions and future needs by statutorily requiring resource management plans for every park and a biennial assessment of systemwide resource conditions and trends.

The dollar amounts in Senate Bill 2130 are based on real numbers. Like the regional list of priority projects, the funding level is not designed to take care of every conceivable need. It is a modest amount, based on the highest priority needs, and intended to make necessary improvements in Park Service capabilities and the condition of resources themselves. It takes into account the budgetary constraints that all federal programs must operate under these days.

A 10-year program would allow the Park Service to address the most pressing resource needs. It would bring about the sense of urgency and institutional commitment that we need. Most importantly, it would build the kind of resource management program that will be needed in the years ahead.

Over the years, the Park Service has responded well to programs addressing urgent problems. For example, when visitation increased dramatically in the early 1950s, the Service responded with Mission '66, a 10-year, $1-billion program to expand existing visitor facilities and build new ones. More recent times have seen major systemwide initiatives to increase law enforcement capabilities and to correct health and safety problems in the parks under the $1-billion Park Restoration and

Improvement Program. Such programs generate a sense of immediacy and collective initiative otherwise difficult to achieve in a highly decentralized system.

Senate Bill 2130 will prevent worthy resource protection projects from being lost amid other priorities. The current system, which provides year-by-year funding corresponding to the annual budget cycle, makes it difficult for park superintendents to plan intelligently for efforts that will take several years to design and implement. A long-term program, while not eliminating the influence of changing priorities, will increase the likelihood of commitment to identified groups of projects.

As we said in National Parks for a New Generation:

> The need for such an effort, which would be roughly half the cost of PRIP spread over double the time, is beyond question; in less fiscally severe times, a larger program over shorter period would be easily justifiable. Although even the costs of a more modest program seem high amid current budget constraints, delaying these initiatives would add significantly to the eventual cost--in those instances where delay did not prevent effective response altogether.

Paying for the Program in an Era of Budgetary Stringency

There can be little disagreement over the central importance of park resources and the tremendous needs they have requiring immediate attention. The funding needs are also clear. The issue then becomes: How are we going to pay for them? Even a modest, urgently needed program such as this might seem ill-conceived in this era of multi-billion dollar budget deficits and Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

As was proposed in the Foundation's report and now contained in Senate Bill 2130, Congress should consider a modest increase in National Park entrance fees, specifically designating the revenues from these and user fees to pay for an improved resource management and visitor interpretation program. In this manner, the needed program will be revenue-neutral and not interfere with the targets of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

We do not come lightly to recommending raising National Park entrance fees. America's National Parks are unique, not only for the spectacular resources they preserve, but also for the democratic access they provide. Inexpensive or free visits to the parks stand as a remarkable symbol of our country's desire to have citizens from all walks of life on equal terms enjoy the wonders of our natural and cultural heritage. This reality and symbol should not be tampered with unless very compelling, special circumstances require it.

By recognizing the tremendous needs of park resources in a comprehensive way and the current budgetary situation, I believe that Senate Bill 2130 provides us with a reasonable way of meeting both national priorities. In addition, its modest approach to raising fees as compared to the approach under the proposed National Park Service Entrance Fee Act of 1986 (Senate Bill 2204) meets more closely the democratic principles that our National Park System represents.

Unlike the Administration's fee bill (S. 2204) which allows park entrance fees to increase up to $10 per carload and sets the annual Golden Eagle pass at $40, Senate Bill 2130 limits entrance fees to $5 per carload and the Golden Eagle pass to $25. Both bills allow volunteers to collect fees, exclude urban and multiple access areas from fee requirements, and enable educational and nonprofit groups to enter the parks without paying.

There are, however, two other major differences between the approaches in the bills. As I have noted, Senate Bill 2130 allocates the revenues from both entrance and user fees to specific resource management and interpretation needs without further appropriation. The Administration's bill (S. 2204), on the other hand, simply has the proceeds of the fees going to provide for operation of the National Park System; no specific programs to benefit the parks or the visitors are mentioned, and under the Administration's proposed budget for fiscal year 1987, fee revenues are apparently used for programs that would be otherwise eliminated or reduced. Senate Bill 2130 also contains a provision for monthly fee-free days to parks to ensure that no one is denied access because of cost; the Administration's fee bill has no such provision.

Poll after poll of park users since the mid-1970s has shown an overwhelming willingness by visitors to pay higher fees for entering and using the National Parks with one caveat: so long as the fees come back to benefit the parks in some special way.

In line with this, Mr. Chairman, we support an increase in park entrance fees providing the following conditions are met:

- o the fee increase is modest and remains charged on the basis of per carload, not per person;
- o parks in urban areas are excluded from charging entrance fees, as are other parks where a variety of access points would make collection infeasible;
- o a system of periodic fee-free days is established, as is done with some museums in the United States and Europe, to ensure that no one is excluded because of cost from our National Parks;
- o most importantly, the revenues from increased entrance fees and other user fees be returned to the parks to reimburse them for the costs of collection and to be used for some special purpose of direct benefit to the

> parks and users beyond that which is not already provided through the base operating budget. After ten years when the goals of this legislation have been satisfied, fees would once again be returned to the Land and Water Conservation Fund or its successor.

This last point is critical and deserves emphasis. One major concern we have over raising fees and returning the proceeds from them to the parks is that the regular appropriations for the Park Service might then be reduced to reflect the increase received from fee revenues. Revenues from fees should not pay for basic operations of the parks provided for under the current budget, nor provide a basis for reducing appropriations in the future. This would set an unfortunate precedent. Fee revenues cannot become an excuse for letting the Park Service lose ground in preserving and maintaining the majesty of the Park System. They should be used only to supplement existing programs.

Proceeds from fees, if they are not to continue going to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, should go toward protecting and enhancing the very things that the visitor comes to see--the resources of the parks--and the way they are interpreted. These are the reasons why we have parks and why they are so heavily visited. In this way, the parks benefit, and the visitor receives some direct, additional benefit for paying the increased fee. Only if increased fee revenues are allocated for resource and interpretative programs and become supplemental to the current level of spending, will the Park Service be able to respond to the urgent natural and cultural resource needs of the parks and the needs of park visitors. Only in this way are increased fees justifiable.

Conclusion

It may strike you as out-of-step to be suggesting a major new initiative for our parks at this juncture. While this is a time for austerity and cost-effectiveness, it is not a time for do-nothingism, especially when it comes to something as special and treasured as our National Park System. The past is filled with examples of leaders responding to the needs of the parks in ways that fit the context they were operating in--be it Stephen Mather enlisting the support of the private sector to promote the parks or the design and construction of beautiful structures during the Depression. Similarly today, it is a time to be visionary and respond to the urgent needs of park resources within appropriate budgetary constraints.

As I have stated to the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors, "In the coming era, stewardship of land resources used for recreation must have a higher priority." We have a tremendous asset in our National Parks; we must build on their enormous goodwill and take better care of what we have.

Some might criticize the program put forth in Senate Bill 2130 as being too concerned with park resources. Some may chide it as anti-park visitor. No characterization could be more off base. Nothing in the bill restricts or in any way inhibits park use. In fact, a number of the projects that would be carried out under this legislation, such as rehabilitating the plumbing and heating system at historic Old Faithful Lodge in Yellowstone and the campgrounds at Mount Rainier and Olympic in Washington, would be of immediate and direct benefit to park visitors. Moreover, by improving resources and interpretation, the bill is intended to enhance the visitor experience.

Let me reiterate what I wrote in National Parks for a New Generation: "The parks are indeed for people." Americans in ever-increasing numbers are enjoying this country's rich heritage of natural, cultural, and recreational resources in our National Park System--millions of children and the elderly, the handicapped and time-constrained, the sedentary and the backpackers, the blue collar worker and the aging baby boomer.

> "...All derive pleasure and sustenance from the parks, many in different parts of the parks, with varying levels of services and accommodations.
>
> Any excessively restrictive policy on use and access could not long survive for the most committed advocates for the parks are people who have been to them. Yet there is no real danger of an excessively protectionist policy. Quite the opposite is true: growing impacts of visitors, increased development, incompatible and polluting activities around park boundaries--these are the real problems confronting today's parks. And for that reason, resources management must have unprecedented priority for the National Park System if public use and enjoyment is to remain meaningful in the years ahead."

As Frederick Law Olmsted wisely understood, resource protection and visitor enjoyment are intertwined. People who enjoy the resources are their most effective advocates. Interpretation of resources to heighten enjoyment of the resources is one of the great innovations in America's National Parks. For many, a campfire talk, a clear map and well-written brochure, a wayside marker deepen the experience. They also provide opportunities to educate visitors about park resources and the kinds of activities that are most compatible with ensuring their continued grandeur in the future.

It is these two--effective management of park resources and strengthened interpretative programs--that are at the heart of the National Park System. They are, afterall, what is meant by preservation and use--the twin goals of the parks. They are also at the heart of what the National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986 (Senate Bill 2130) seeks to accomplish in a modest, cost-effective, achievable way. For this reason, I urge your support of it.

Once again, Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to present my thoughts on Senate Bill 2130. Thank you very much.

Senator **WALLOP**. Bill, thank you.
Paul Pritchard.

STATEMENT OF PAUL C. PRITCHARD, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION; ACCOMPANIED BY LAURA BEATTY

Mr. **PRITCHARD**. Good morning, sir. I am pleased to have with me Laura Beatty this morning. Because of the detail in this particular bill and the comparison which we have tried to provide for you between the administration bill and Senator Durenberger's bill, we wanted to be able to give you as much accurate information. The numbers seem to be numbing in a sense, and I think it is important to be able to compare really, is there any net gain between the various approaches as proposed before you.

I would like to this morning just highlight my testimony in the time we have, so that some of the specific details can be presented.

Let me begin by saying that our association is very supportive of Senator Durenberger's legislation, proposed legislation, because as Mr. Reilly has pointed out, it does in fact, we believe, bring about the preservation, protection and revitalization of the Park Service System which is very crucial today.

For some time we have proposed eight points, which we think any fee system should comport with. If I might, those are listed on the first and second pages of the testimony. It is very crucial as we go through our evaluation of these two bills just to highlight those eight points:

One, a fee structure should not lead to self-sufficiency by the Park System.

Two, it should not be used to offset or reduce funds available through appropriations.

Three, the agency which collects the fees should retain them.

Four, the allocation of revenues collected should be based on resource needs.

Five, we also believe that the an entrance fee should not be considered an access fee.

Sixth, we believe that the agencies should have flexibility in the way they use those funds.

Seventh, the fees should not be prohibitively high.

Eighth, finally, we think that public lands fees are appropriate at widely differing levels wherever special facilities, services, and activities are provided.

Using those eight criteria, we have found the administration bill does not meet our criteria and therefore we cannot support this entrance fee proposal, especially in the following areas:

First, it does attempt to make park programs self-sufficient.

Second, the proposal contains no criteria as to how the undistributed funds will be allocated.

Third, we believe that the increase from $10 to $40 is excessive. There is also no cap in the legislation as to how high these already high fees could go following the years of this higher increase.

We do think the administration's proposal, though, does merit recognition; that it does not have a fee for urban recreation areas, which we think would be difficult, if not impossible, to collect and also would deny people daily access. We commend that legislation for that.

In contrast, Senator Durenberger's bill meets the relevant sections of the criteria in several ways:

First, it is not assessed with any intention of making the park program self-sufficient.

Second, there is no question that the proposal augments underfunded resource programs, and we believe that that is the most important issue here and not so much the issue of the collection of fees.

Third, the proposal provides flexibility.

And, fourth, the proposal does not call for excessive fees.

Specifically, we are very concerned that there is a legal requirement today regarding the upkeep of the units of the national park system and that legal requirement is in the original enabling legislation as passed by Congress in 1916. Therefore, we believe that the use of appropriated funds from the general treasury to carry out the basic operations of the Park Service should remain the primary means of maintaining the national park units.

Entrance fees should be identical in each area in terms of the flexibility. We go into some detail as to why that might be possible, talking specifically about the Cumberland Island example. I will not repeat that, since you have already discussed that.

And as previous witnesses have noted, to date there is no major effort to correct the resource problems, though, that exist at various park areas. We supported the Park Restoration and Improvement Program several years ago. We believe the pendulum has definitely swung.

Secretary Watt said in 1981 when discussing the "State of the Parks Report," which was referred to earlier, that: "Analysis should continue and actions vigorously pursued to monitor, prevent and mitigate significant threats."

I believe that this proposal before you that Senator Durenberger has proposed does in fact address Secretary Watt's statements.

Mr. Chairman, we are preparing now a national park system plan, and in that planning effort we have identified or assembled 211 natural and cultural resource management plans in our data base with the needs equivalent to $434 million of need. And that is approximately 36 percent. The moneys are needed for projets relating to historic preservation, problems cause by vandalism, by lack of preservation maintenance, by visitor impact, and by lack of technical structural knowledge.

The next largest call on the funds is projects designed to research, monitor, and mitigate threats to natural vegetation, from encroachment, from air pollution, from water quality, and water quantity problems.

The 10 Regional Park Service offices were recently asked to identify their top 100 natural resource projects. These 1,000 projects represent over $234 million in unmet needs. We give you some examples of this, and attached to my statement are specifically listed by State the resource management needs.

I will not repeat what Senator Durenberger, and Senator Hatfield, and Mr. Reilly have already noted as specific examples. I know you are aware of the problems in Grand Teton, and Yellowstone, and there are many others. In Arkansas, for example, the need for an archeological survey in the Buffalo River.

All of this our list shows to represent some $234 million worth of projects. We believe this list could actually be somewhere in the neighborhood of twice as much, in the neighborhood of $443 million worth of cost.

The resource management programs that have been prepared by the Park Service that were referred to earlier have not been assembled, have not been looked at in detail, and have not been used as a way of allocating funds. We believe that that must be done if we are going to have a legitimate assessment of what the true need is.

Finally, we would like to know the need for the biennial report which is crucial. Because there is no specific report, it gives an assessment to you of what is the need in the system, and that report is very important and is identified as an important piece of Senator Durenberger's legislation.

In conclusion, we would just simply say that we have a rich and diverse heritage, a heritage that must be protected. It is our generation which will be responsible for passing that on to future generations. If we do not make these dollars available and set them aside for these specific problems that we have identified, that heritage will be lost.

We appreciate the opportunity to testify and to discuss in any way we can and move forward with relevant legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Pritchard follows:]

STATEMENT OF PAUL C. PRITCHARD, PRESIDENT
NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, RESERVED WATER
AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION

A HEARING ON S. 2204 AND S. 2130

JUNE 12, 1986

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Paul C. Pritchard, President, National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA), headquartered at 1701 18th Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. Since 1919, NPCA has served as a private, nonprofit defender of the resources and purposes of the units of the National Park System.

We appreciate the opportunity to present comments on legislation that would authorize the collection of fees at the entrance to certain parks units and direct how those revenues are distributed. There are significant differences between the bill sponsored by the Administration, S. 2204, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to permit the use of park entrance, admission, and recreation use fees for the operation of the National Park System, and the bill sponsored by Senator Durenburger, S. 2130, to preserve, protect, and revitalize the National Park System.

NPCA supports fully S. 2130 for the reasons set forth below.

NPCA POSITION

At this subcommittee's oversight hearing last June 27, NPCA stated its support for entrance fees at appropriate NPS units if the following criteria were met:

* Fees should not be assessed with any idea of making national park programs self-sufficient.

* Fees collected should not be used to offset or reduce funds available through appropriation, but to augment or expand the existing programs.

* The agency which collects the fees should retain the funds thus derived. These funds should be held in a central repository (or dedicated account) rather than being retained at the local unit which happens to collect the fees.

* The allocation of revenues collected should be based on resource needs to avoid gilding of the most popular areas and to assure that managers do not allow fee collections to become a dominant management factor.

National Parks and Conservation Association, 1701 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
telephone (202) 265-2717

* Entrance fees should not be considered an access fee. Rather, fees should be based on the impact of the visitor on the resource and that visitor's use of the park resource and so justified to the public.

* Any fee program should have flexibility to ensure that proper consideration is given to the feasibility of collection, public policy, visitor benefits, comparable charges of non-federal agencies and other pertinent factors as described in Section 4(d) of the 1972 Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

* Fees should not be prohibitively high as to prevent the use of national parks by citizens at any level of the socio-economic ladder.

* Public land fees are appropriate at widely differing levels wherever special facilities, services or activities are provided. The level of fees can be based to some extent on comparability with fees in the private sector. This comparison should be used only for determining the maximum fee and should not be used as a factor in setting the minimum fee.

HOW DO S. 2204 AND S. 2130 STAND UP TO NPCA'S ENTRANCE FEE CRITERIA?

I. The Administration's bill, S. 2204, does not meet our criteria for supporting an entrance fee proposal in the following areas:

1. The proposal does not provide for the enhancement of park operational activities as it claims, but attempts to make park programs self-sufficient by offsetting or reducing funds available through regular appropriations. We should not forget why the National Park Service had its hands tied by the Congress in 1979 when a moratorium was placed on further fee collection. At that time, the Carter Administration's Office of Management and Budget suggested that it would reduce the Park Service budget by $12 million by ordering the NPS to raise an additional $12 million through additional fee collections. Yet the current Administration proposal goes well beyond what was proposed and rejected in 1979, as follows:

a) Of the $73.8 million projected to be raised by this legislation through increased fees, only $14.2 million would be allocated for projects not considered basic park operations in the FY'87 budget, or promised to the general Treasury.

b) Five park programs, whose recommended budgets were either cut or eliminated in the Administration's FY'87 budget, would be supplemented or restored by the collection of fees. For example, the Volunteers-In-Parks program was cut from the NPS budget entirely, however the Administration will support the program if it is funded by fees.

2. The proposal contains no criteria as to how the undistributed funds ($14.2 million in FY'87) will be allocated among the parks in the System, except "as determined by the Secretary, for operation of the

National Park System." Without specific instructions in the bill regarding how the fee revenues will be allocated, now and in the future, or any requirement for a full accounting by the Secretary to the Congress over how the funds are allocated, the Congress will loose all authority over how the Secretary allocates those funds.

3. The proposal contains an increase in the Golden Eagle Passport fee from $10 to $40 annually. Also important here is what the proposal does not say. It is silent on how much fees will increase at the individual parks. Yet Administration projections are based on increases that we can not support, i.e., a fee schedule of $3, $5, and $10, depending on the park. Further, there is no cap in the legislation as to how high these already high fees could go in the next several years.

The Administration meets one of the criteria by proposing to exclude urban recreation areas from charging fees. This provision ensures that the city park user will not be turned away from these centrally located parks. Both bills have this identical provision.

II. In contrast, Senator Durenberger's bill, S. 2130, meets the relevant sections of the criteria, as follows:

1. The fees recommended in this proposal are not assessed with any intention of making park programs self-sufficient; rather, the fees are dedicated to a program to preserve and revitalize the natural and cultural resources of the entire National Park System. Most importantly, there is no question about how the fees will be used since the Secretary is directed to prepare guidelines based on strict Congressional requirements.

2. There is no question that this proposal augments underfunded resource programs, and creates the opportunity for other resource programs that are long overdue. Unlike the Administration's proposal, all the fees collected are to be returned to the parks.

3. The proposal provides flexibility in fee schedules by dedicating one fee-free day a month and ensuring free entrance for educational and research purposes.

4. The proposal does not call for excessive fees. The Golden Eagle Passport would be increased to $25, rather than $40, and a cap of $5 is placed on any individual entrance fee.

COLLECTED FEES SHOULD NOT BE USED TO OFFSET REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS FOR BASIC PARK OPERATIONS.

There is a legal requirement regarding the upkeep of the units of the National Park System that can be found in the 1916 Organic Act of the NPS. The act requires the NPS to preserve the resources for the use of the public now and in the future. It should be noted that this requirement is not contingent upon the amount of revenues collected from the visiting public. We support the long-held notion that the natural and cultural resources of the National Park System, as well as those resources located on the remainder of our public lands, belong to all Americans, whether they use them directly or not. Therefore, the use of appropriated funds from the general Treasury to carry out the basic operations of the Park Service should remain the primary means of maintaining our national park units. Any entrance fees collected from the public should not be used to offset regular appropriations for basic operations nor should those funds be deposited in the LWCF account for land acquisition purposes (OCS leasing receipts are sufficient for this purpose).

FLEXIBILITY FOR CHANGING FEES.

Entrance fees cannot and should not be identical at every site. Flexibility to determine where and whether to make collections will more accurately reflect individuals situations, within the NPS as well as the other federal agencies. For example, both of the current proposals recognize the practicality of providing free entrance at urban recreation areas. Other situations must also be considered, like the situation where visitors must pay $7.80 to a boat transportation concessioner for roundtrip passage to Cumberland Island National Seashore. Should a visitor then have to pay an additional fee to enter the Island? Because of the variety of situations at park units throughout the country, flexibility in fee charges is absolutely essential.

NPCA SUPPORT FOR RESOURCE PRESERVATION PROVISIONS OF S. 2130

S.2130, The National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986 is the necessary complement to the Administration's desire to raise entrance fees at units of the National Park System. New monies need to be directed toward solving the park's natural and cultural resources problems. Over $1 billion has been spent over the last five years to improve the infrastructure associated with the parks -- the roads, sewers, bridges and other facilities. Although the 1980 State of the Parks Report and the 1982 Threats to Cultural Resources Report quite clearly indicate the crying need to better conserve and protect the natural and cultural resources of the parks, to date there has been no major effort to correct these resource preservation problems.

It is time for the pendulum to swing and for balance to be restored to NPS budget priorities. Even former Secretary James Watt in 1981 when discussing the State of the Parks Report recommended that "analysis...should continue, and actions vigorously pursued to monitor, prevent or mitigate significant threats." The National Park Service has had to struggle with the reality of decreasing dollars available for an increasing resource preservation need. Generating new sources of money through entrance fees and returning these monies to the Parks to preserve the resources may be our only hope.

NPCA has been engaged in a multi-year review of the National Park Service and is developing a National Park System Plan for the future. As a part of that review we are trying to catalog and computerize each park's Resource Management Plan (RMP). A comprehensive System-wide review of these plans has not been done by the National Park Service. We currently have 211 Natural and Cultural Resource Management Plans in our data base with an identified dollar need of over $434 million. Approximately 36% of these monies are needed for projects relating to historic buildings. These resources are threatened by vandalism, lack of preservation maintenance, visitor impacts and lack of technical structural knowledge. The next largest call on funds is for projects designed to research, monitor and mitigate threats to native vegetation from encroachment, air pollution, water quality and water quantity.

Each of the 10 Regional NPS offices was recently asked to identify its top 100 natural resources projects. These 1,000 plus projects represent over $234 million in unmet needs. These 1000 projects average just three activities per park -- well short of meeting the park's total resource preservation needs.

Attached to my statement is a list of the resource projects for parks in several selected States. I must remind you that our data base presently includes only 63% of the NPS areas so the dollar needs represented by our figures are lower than total need.

Examples of Resource Needs

I would like to provide the Committee with some specific examples of project requests where the basic resource is being threatened:

1. At Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming there is no water resource management plan. There are insufficient funds to monitor park water quality or to test existing wells for suspected sewage contamination. Illegal dumping of sewage still occurs.

2. At Lehman Caves National Monument in Nevada human-caused, uncontrolled algae growth in the caves threatens the natural biology and the very appearance of the cave formations. Also needed is a archeological survey estimated to cost $344,000 over five years.

3. At Yellowstone National Park, where Congress appropriated $19.9 million in 1979 to buy back ownershop of the Old Faithful Inn a need of $1 million is now identified for weatherization and other necessary work. Approximately $2.5 million is needed to stabilize and preserve Fort Yellowstone.

4. At Carlsbad Caverns National Park in New Mexico numerous alterations and proposed alterations of surface terrain affect water infiltration and cave microclimate. More information is desparately needed to better understand the fragile cave environment. Also needed in New Mexico are basic resource studies for Ft. Union and Salinas and funding to survey and stabilize sites at Gila Cliff Dwellings, Chaco, and Bandalier.

5. In Arkansas, an archeological survey is needed at Buffalo River, while historic resource studies and rehabilitation of historic structures are needed at Fort Smith, Arkansas Post, and Buffalo River.

These are but a few examples of projects which may be of interest to the Subcommittee. The NPS list of $234 million worth of projects represents 1000 plus projects. The NPCA list of $443 million worth represents 3900 projects.

If you are not able to walk the hills and dales of our National Parks, as many Americans will this summer, to see the conditions of these threaten resources then you must listen to the resource managers charged with preserving the resources. The need for more money to continue the parks legacy has never been more clear.

Using either the park level expressed need or that defined by the Regional NPS offices, it is clear that the monies requested by S.2130 are needed -- urgently -- and can be wisely spent. Indeed if these monies are not spent, we are in danger of loosing the very resources these areas are set aside to protect.

S.2130 requires the development of Resource Management Plans for each unit with a review required for each plan after five years. We wholeheartedly endorse this suggestion. In response to the 1980 State of the Parks Report the NPS did require the development of park by park Plans to identify research needs, threatened resources and mitigation plans to try to solve these problems.

We believe that it is at the park level that an identification and prioritization of resource needs must begin. To date there has been no comprehensive review by the NPS of the RMPs as a whole, no central collection of the RMPs, nor any approved approach to systematized problem solving.

Current Problems with Resource Preservation Funding Programs.

The Special Resources Preservation Account tried to establish a service-wide priority list of natural resource projects but this effort was fraught with problems-- not the least of which was too few dollars trying to solve too many problems. Parks were asked to nominate priority projects but the ground rules only allowed projects which dealt with a single park and which could be completed within 3 years.

Likewise, the Cultural Resource Preservation Program is the essential funding source for stabilization and preservation work, and is the primary source for basic research and data collection activities such as archeological surveys, historic resource studies, preservation guides, historic structure reports, and museum object cataloging. Although the program has been funded at an average of about $5 million for the past couple of years, the documented need exceeds that amount: $14.3 million for FY'86, $20.9 million for FY'87, and $17.1 million for the years 1988-1990.

Inadequate funding for this program has necessarily shifted the majority of the funds to emergency projects for stabilization and fabric repair leaving little funding for research.

S.2130 earmarks $12 million for the 100 most critical problems as defined by the Secretary. In addition, some monies should be earmarked for each area so that there is some hope that each park's number one priority problem will get some attention within a three year period.

Research Needs.

The bill further requires the establishment of more uniform methods of collecting information. This requirement should be broadened to go beyond collecting information to sharing solutions. At present this kind of communication within the park system is haphazard and no approved process exists to encourage a cross-fertilization of problem solving ideas. There is no incentive for Parks to cooperatively assess methodologies and widely implement proven solutions.

NPCA's review of the RMP's revealed that in many instances the units share common problems but the Service does little to encourage or require shared solutions. For example, nine of the 211 parks surveyed have an interest in bighorn sheep reintroduction, or studies relevant to bighorn populations. The cost of the proposed projects is over $1 million. A similiar situation exists with respect to peregrine falcon reintroduction: Eight parks submitted project statements totalling in excess of $350,000. Certainly local habitat and population conditions can vary, but there is ample opportunity for information and expertise sharing.

Resource maintenance problems that also rely on an accumulation of experience. For example, 25 parks noted some problem with the exotic plant species, Russian thistle. Here is a chance for different parks to attempt different control strategies, then combine information for dispersal on a Systemwide basis. Another similar situation would be projects that call for revegetation of some sort. Among 23 parks, revegetation needs are pegged at over $3 million.

The Need for Trained Resource Specialists.

The staffing and training provisions of S.2130 are mandatory . While the circumstances vary widely within the System one can find a trained resources manager being required to perform totally unrelated activities or a resources specialists slot being filled by an undertrained individual. The resources training center could facilitate the exchange of ideas so badly needed, as well as to help to ensure uniformity in the caliber of resources specialists across the Service, and to upgrade the standing of the resource specialists within the Service as these positions become more valuable and rewarding. A similar result could be derived through several universities.

Many parks and regions have a serious shortage of resource specialists. A need for 14 cultural resource management specialists has been identified in the Southwest Region alone, including historians, archeologists, historic architects, and curators.

The Need for a Biennial Report.

The 1980 State of the Park Report offered some startling insight into the conditions of the dream of Stephen Mather and others. We must maintain some benchmarks. The biennial systemwide assessment called for in S.2130 offers the needed reassessment. Problems change -- priorities vary. We need to assess the effects of this renewed effort to protect the resources to help the NPS test its methods and correct its course over time.

Conclusion.

Passage of S. 2130 could very well mean the future for the natural and cultural resources of the National Park System--a rich and diverse heritage that belongs to all Americans. With the increase in entrance fees, now is the opportunity to take the collected revenues and commit them to a program where park users can see a direct benefit of their contribution.

It is clear that the monies derived from the modest increase of entrance fees requested by S. 2130 are needed--urgently-- and can be wisely spent. Indeed, if these monies are not spent, we are in danger of losing the very resources these areas are set aside to protect. Funds collected from entrance fees should not be used to offset the cost of basic park operations. The use of appropriated funds from the general Treasury to carry out the basic park operations should remain the primary means of maintaining our National Park System. Critical resource needs documented within the System can not be remedied without a commitment to the program outlined in S. 2130.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on these measures. We urge the Subcommittee to act quickly and favorably on S. 2130.

For further information:

Susan Buffone, 202-265-2717

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT BRIEF

State: Wyoming

National Park System units in state: 6

Yellowstone NP
Grand Teton NP
Devils Tower NM
Fossil Butte NM
Fort Laramie NHS
(John D. Rockefeller Mem. PKWY)

Number of units surveyed (% surveyed): 5 (83%)

(unsurveyed units in parantheses above)

Resource Management Needs:

1. Air Quality: $337,120

2. Archaeological Sites: $32,000

3. Battlefields:

4. Cultural Artifacts: $44,000

5. Cultural Buildings: $310,000

6. Cultural Landscape: $5,000

7. Geophysical Resources: $1,157,400

8. Monuments/Statuary:

9. Vegetation: $3,128,850

10. Visitors/Aesthetics: $5,571,860

11. Wildlife: $7,758,370

12. Water Quality: $639,920

13. Water Quantity: $49,500

TOTAL: $19,034,020

National Parks and Conservation Association
1701 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
Telephone (202) 265-2717

For further information:

Susan Buffone, 202-265-2717

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT BRIEF

State: New Mexico

National Park System units in state: 11

Aztec Ruins NM
Bandelier NM
Fort Union NM
Pecos NM
Capulin Mountain NM
Salinas NM
El Morro NM
Gila Cliff Dwellings NM
Carlsbad Caverns NP
(Chaco Culture NHP)
(White Sands NM)

Number of units surveyed (% surveyed): 9 (82%)

(unsurveyed units in parantheses above)

Resource Management Needs:

1. Air Quality: $113,000
2. Archaeological Sites: $2,073,700
3. Battlefields:
4. Cultural Artifacts: $825,600
5. Cultural Buildings: $1,566,000
6. Cultural Landscape: $29,000
7. Geophysical Resources: $57,570
8. Monuments/Statuary:
9. Vegetation: $466,120
10. Visitors/Aesthetics: $291,850
11. Wildlife: $509,120
12. Water Quality: $48,000
13. Water Quantity: $67,940

TOTAL: $6,047,900

For further information:

Susan Buffone, 202-265-2717

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT BRIEF

State: Nevada

National Park System units in state: 2

Lehman Caves NM
Lake Mead NRA

Number of units surveyed (% surveyed): 2 (100%)

(unsurveyed units in parantheses above)

Resource Management Needs:

1. Air Quality: $251,000
2. Archaeological Sites: $364,750
3. Battlefields:
4. Cultural Artifacts:
5. Cultural Buildings: $13,000
6. Cultural Landscape: $28,000
7. Geophysical Resources: $13,100
8. Monuments/Statuary:
9. Vegetation: $304,600
10. Visitors/Aesthetics: $198,600
11. Wildlife: $222,000
12. Water Quality: $132,000
13. Water Quantity: $30,400

TOTAL: $1,557,450

National Parks and Conservation Association
1701 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
Telephone (202) 265-2717

For further information:

Susan Buffone, 202-265-2717

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT BRIEF

State: New Jersey

National Park System units in state: 2

Morristown NHS
Edison NHS

Number of units surveyed (% surveyed): 2 (100%)

(unsurveyed units in parantheses above)

Resource Management Needs:

1. Air Quality: $45,000
2. Archaeological Sites: $80,000
3. Battlefields:
4. Cultural Artifacts: $804,000
5. Cultural Buildings: $675,000
6. Cultural Landscape: $35,000
7. Geophysical Resources:
8. Monuments/Statuary:
9. Vegetation: $125,000
10. Visitors/Aesthetics: $117,000
11. Wildlife: $61,000
12. Water Quality: $15,000
13. Water Quantity:

TOTAL: $1,957,500

For further information:

Susan Buffone, 202-265-2717

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT BRIEF

State: Arkansas

National Park System units in state: 5

Pea Ridge NMP	(Hot Springs NP)
Buffalo NR	
Arkansas Post N MEM	
(Fort Smith NHS)	

Number of units surveyed (% surveyed): 3 (60%)

(unsurveyed units in parantheses above)

Resource Management Needs:

1. Air Quality: $264,000
2. Archaeological Sites: $860,000
3. Battlefields:
4. Cultural Artifacts: $215,000
5. Cultural Buildings: $400,000
6. Cultural Landscape: $285,000
7. Geophysical Resources: $346,000
8. Monuments/Statuary:
9. Vegetation: $180,000
10. Visitors/Aesthetics: $386,000
11. Wildlife: $423,000
12. Water Quality: $312,000
13. Water Quantity: $30,000

TOTAL: $3,701,000

For further information:

Susan Buffone, 202-265-2717

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT BRIEF

State: Idaho

National Park System units in state: 2

Craters of the Moon NM
Nez Perce NHP

Number of units surveyed (% surveyed): 2 (100%)

(unsurveyed units in parantheses above)

Resource Management Needs:

1. Air Quality: $132,000
2. Archaeological Sites: $112,000
3. Battlefields:
4. Cultural Artifacts: $66,600
5. Cultural Buildings: $46,100
6. Cultural Landscape:
7. Geophysical Resources: $128,800
8. Monuments/Statuary:
9. Vegetation: $133,900
10. Visitors/Aesthetics: $22,000
11. Wildlife: $10,000
12. Water Quality:
13. Water Quantity:

TOTAL: $649,700

National Parks and Conservation Association
1701 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
Telephone (202) 265-2717

For further information:

Susan Buffone, 202-265-2717

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT BRIEF

State: Oregon

National Park System units in state: 4

Crater Lake NP
Fort Clatsop NMEM
John Day Fossil Beds NM
(Oregon Caves NM)

Number of units surveyed (surveyed): 3 (75%)

(unsurveyed units in parentheses above)

Resource Management Needs:

1. Air Quality: $39,500

2. Archaeological Sites: $151,000

3. Battlefields:

4. Cultural Artifacts: $119,100

5. Cultural Buildings: $114,200

6. Cultural Landscape:

7. Geophysical Resources: $299,500

8. Monuments/Statuary:

9. Vegetation: $884,800

10. Visitors/Aesthetics: $52,500

11. Wildlife: $194,000

12. Water Quality: $770,200

13. Water Quantity:

TOTAL: $2,635,300

National Parks and Conservation Association
1701 Eighteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
Telephone (202) 265-2717

Senator **Wallop**. Paul, thank you.

Let me just make an observation. I don't know of any of the proposals that are in front of us or that have been offered that are a substitute for the appropriations process.

You know that this committee has been and the Appropriations Committee has been some successful in adding moneys, but that is finite, as anybody observing the scene can tell now. And to have these as supplemental funding levels still seems prudent. You know, in an ideal world, it would be nice to have the entire park system 100 percent free, although I am not certain, frankly, of the total benefit of that.

One of the reasons for vandalism sometimes is lack of appreciation for the very thing that people are in, because they figure that the Government has got money enough to clean it up.

My own feeling as I look at these two bills, is that there is a melding of them necessary. I look at the $40 fee for the Golden Eagle. On the one hand, that seems rather high, and, on the other hand, to lower it will lower the other fees, the individual park fees.

If you can buy your year's pass for 1½ times the entry fee, then it is clear what you are going to be doing. Those parks who could benefit by the visitors' fee will suffer; you know, their portion of it.

So I urge you to kind of stay with us, work with us as we examine what the appropriate schedule is, because I don't pretend to know. I can see arguments on both sides of it.

Let me ask each of you to comment. You were both here in the room when we began. I really do not like the idea of a lot of internal fees in the park, either for interpretive lectures, or visits to visitor centers, or museums within a park. I would rather have it so that when you paid to go into the park—but for something like a campground—that you had paid, that the park was yours to roam—for two reasons: One, I think the public is a better allocator of its time and its attention than we could ever be through a fee structure. And two is, it is much more expensive to collect a selection of fees than it is one.

Even though the overall fee might be a lot less than the cumulative set of fees would be, I still think the Government would come out ahead and the people would be more satisfied.

Do you have any reaction to that?

Mr. **Reilly**. Senator, I tend to agree with that, but I would like to make a point about fees. I think it is natural and probably inevitable that we are going to spend a lot of time over the next months in considering these two bills and the merits of each, talking about fee increases.

S. 2130, however, is not primarily I think about fees. It has got a lot more in it. It is not just to deal with spending. I sense, and you pointed out, that the Congress does not visit the fee question very often, they last did it in 1972.

I sense that this year the special circumstances that we confront, the needs that we have all described, might present an opportunity for something of a compromise, an historic compromise maybe on the fee question, whereby acceptance on the part of the communities that have long resisted or are very wary of fees, the conservation community, is bottomed on an allocation of those revenues to deal with the most urgent conservation needs in the parks, recognizing that probably we are not going to get that money anywhere else.

But then I think the question is, well, what in fact are we going to do with those revenues, and are we going to apply them to meet the real needs that the parks have and which the public has shown is the sole basis for tolerating increased fees or for supporting them.

Senator **Wallop**. I do not have any quarrel with that. I have a quarrel with how much detail we can arrange that distribution without beginning to overfocus the penchant of the Park Service personnel within a given park. I mean there is some level of detail, but I think there is a moment in there where you want to have a bigger panorama than a smaller one.

Mr. **Reilly**. I think we have always got to strike something of a balance between requiring priority attention to certain important problems and not overdetailing how they are dealt with. But in the present environment, it seems to me inevitable that the pressures will be enormous at the other end of the street to pay for existing programs which otherwise would be phased out, to divert revenues to daily maintenance kinds of problems and questions. That has been the tradition for a long time. The kinds of things we are talking about needing attention have long been neglected by successive administrations, because of the daily needs, because of the needs of next year.

I think that is the reason for some of the specificity in this bill. We have also heard some criticism that it is not specific enough, that there is too much discretion in it.

Senator **Wallop**. Well, you won't hear that from me because I have sat around here long enough to watch and see how inflexible it is. Once it is that part, it is both hard to change and hard to administer, and you have urgent needs which should appropriately be confined within the general picture which you seek to paint, and yet can't be done within the specific language.

I don't know precisely, but I just think we should work upon it a little bit.

Mr. **Mantell**. Could I add to that for just a moment, Senator, if I may?

The Park Service, as a result of its "State of the Parks Report," embarked upon a major study to determine what needed to be done to meet the problems arrived at in that report. That program consisted of more training, more restoration projects, more research and monitoring, cooperation with universities, and more inventorying of park resources.

In not one instance has the Park Service fulfilled the things that it set out to do, because of other priorities coming up. It is the concern that resources get pushed aside because other temporary crises come up that led, I think, to the detail that is in that bill, to make sure that these things are actually done and that some of the more immediate priorities, short-term crises, do not take precedence.

Senator **Wallop**. The concern is legitimate. It is just a question of how it is achieved. I have no quarrel with the concern. I am just not entirely certain that if you get down to the arena of micromanagement that you don't miss some of the things that you would really very much like to have had happen, and that is really my only concern there.

Mr. **Pritchard**. Mr. Chairman, I think your point is well-taken. I think there will be much pain and no gain with some of these fee structures. The best place to collect them would be at the entrance area if we are going to have them, and it would make a lot more sense.

I think it is difficult, though, to expect volunteers to administer a fee program and I think that is one of the flaws in this proposal.

Senator **Wallop**. It may be; it may not be. You know, one of the things we have not had much of a chance to see is how well that volunteer system works because it changes every year. Nobody knows what to volunteer for.

If I stay around here another summer, I might volunteer myself.

Anyway, thank you both very much. We will be working on this. I appreciate your testimony.

Next, a panel with Mr. Derrick Crandall, president of the American Recreation Coalition; Mr. Michael Schneider, vice president of T.L. Enterprises, representing Good Sam Club; and Mr. Rex Maughan, chairman of the Conference of National Park Concessionaires.

Gentlemen, your entire statements will be in the record.

STATEMENT OF DERRICK A. CRANDALL, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN RECREATION COALITION

Mr. **Crandall**. Thank you, Senator. In the interest of time let me be very brief.

We are pleased to be able to be here and talk about the importance of funding the needs of the National Park System and to comment specifically on the proposals to raise entrance fees, submitted by Senator Durenberger and Senator McClure.

Our perspective, in short, is that entrance fees can and should be raised for our Park System. Americans love their National Parks and that love draws them to the parks in greater numbers each year. Americans will not turn their backs on their parks and indeed can be persuaded to provide financial and other support to those areas.

In reality, few Americans expect a free lunch when it comes to recreation. Skiers and campers, boaters, hikers, fishermen, and other fans of the outdoors know that when they pull into a marina, or go to a campground, or hike a ride on a public trail, or enjoy a program at a visitor center, they pay somehow, somewhere. It is only a question of whether they pay through taxes or fees or in another hidden way.

Too often the consequence of low or no fee recreation has been a steady decline in the number of top quality recreation opportunities available to the American public. When budgets are tight, our parks and recreation programs often take a back seat.

Thus, we support the National Park Service request for higher entrance fees which, for the most part, will be returned to benefit our parks. In fact, the case is not hard to make. In 1948, entrance fees at National Parks generated $2.7 million paid by 29 million visitors, or an average of 9 cents per visitor. Equivalent entrance fee collections, adjusted for both inflation and increased visitors would have generated fees of $87 million in 1983; actually collections were only one-tenth that amount or $8.6 million.

Some would suggest that higher entrance fees will discourage visitations to our parks. We frankly find little evidence to support this fear. Some 25 million people will visit Walt Disney World in 1986 and that visitation has climbed, despite the fact that entrance fees have certainly climbed since the early 1970's.

Other costs in our parks, incurred in visiting our parks, including lodging, have certainly raised their prices without incurring consumer resistance.

Despite our support, though, for higher entrance fees, we have to express some real concerns. First, we regard the entire entrance fee authority question as a small part of the needed rethinking and restructuring of the means by which we fund our Federal Recreation and Conservation Programs.

Fortunately, the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors is at work on this need at the present time and will be making recommendations by yearend.

I have submitted in my testimony some ideas that I would hope that you, as a member of the Commission, will be giving some thought to, including the need to continue to evolve the entrance rates for the national park system.

It is clear that as you suggest, the Congress rarely comes back to revisit the question of what the level should be, so perhaps some kind of a third party should be looked at to look at that. I also believe that the voluntary support for the national parks, whether it is through a restructured Golden Eagle Passport or some other kinds of mechanism to allow Americans to document their love of the parks, can find great favor.

The Duck Stamp Program is a clear evidence that not just hunters are willing to pay for recreation resource that they treasure. Urban park parking fees, for example, are not being considered at today's hearing, but certainly that should be within the province of the issues that the President's Commission looks at.

In sum, I would like to close by simply citing three points. First, we urge that the park service use the collected fees to provide visible services to the visiting public. Acceptance of higher fees will be much, much higher if there is no further deterioration in the interpretive and educational programs at our national parks.

Second, specific entrance fee charges need to be carefully considered. Certainly we heard the documentation of that earlier today, and ongoing evolution toward higher fees may be far preferable than one steep jump, and higher fees should not be structured in a way which discourages group travel to our national parks through buses and other means.

Finally, we ask that this subcommittee and each of its members exercise an active oversight over the budget of the National Park Service and, through these efforts, work to ensure that the suspicions of those who predict dollar-for-dollar cutbacks in general revenues for every new fee collected dollar are not confirmed.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Crandall follows:]

TESTIMONY BY DERRICK A. CRANDALL, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN RECREATION COALITION, BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS REGARDING NATIONAL PARK ENTRANCE FEES, JUNE 12, 1986.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Members, we are pleased to appear this morning to share our views on funding needs of the national park system and proposals to raise entrance fees to many of our parks for the first time in a decade.

Our perspective, in short, is that entrance fees can and should be raised for our park system providing the new fees provide a real gain in the management resources available to protect our parks. Americans love their national parks and their other federal lands. That love draws them to the parks in greater numbers each year. Americans will not turn their backs on the needs of our parks, and indeed can be persuaded to provide financial and other support to these areas.

Few Americans really expect a free lunch. Skiers, campers, boaters, hikers, fishermen and other fans of the outdoors know that when they pull into a public campground, launch their boat at a public marina, hike or ride on a public trail or enjoy a program at a visitor center in a national park or forest they pay. It's only a question of whether they pay in taxes, fees or in another, hidden way.

Too often, the consequence of low- or no-fee recreation has been a steady decline in the number of top-quality recreation opportunities available to us. We've all seen this decline first-hand in recent years -- trails and facilities that are not cared for as well this season as last, visitor centers with reduced staff and hours, and even sites that are now closed, as is the case with hundreds of recreation sites previously maintained by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

One reason for the decline is that public recreation programs compete with thousands of other federally-supported services and programs. When budgets are tight, our parks and recreation needs often take a back seat.

Thus, we support the National Park Service's request for higher entrance fees which, for the most part, will be returned to benefit our parks. The case for higher entrance fees is not a difficult one to make. Entrance fees have been collected since the early days of our earliest national parks. By 1948, entrance fees at national parks generated $2,700,000, paid by 29,000,000 visitors. That sum was an average of 9¢ per visitor. Since 1948, park attendance has grown dramatically. In 1983, 240,000,000 visits were recorded, an eight-fold increase. And inflation changed the value of 9¢ in 1948 to roughly 36¢ in 1983. Equivalent entrance fee collections, adjusted for both inflation and increased visitors, would have generated fees of nearly $87,000,000 in 1983. Actually, collections were one-tenth of that number, or $8,600,000.

And the situation has grown worse since 1983, as the number of sites eligible to collect fees and the allowable charges have remained fixed by Congressional directive. Inflation, while greatly reduced, has continued to erode the value of the collected receipts and visits have increased, especially at non-fee National Park Service sites.

Some would suggest that higher entrance fees will discourage visitations to our parks. We find little reason to fear this consequence. Some 25,000,000 people will visit Walt Disney World in 1986 -- and they will certainly pay an entrance fee which is higher than that charged in the early 1970's. And other costs in our parks have risen without incurring consumer resistance. In 1946, an overnight stay in the lodge at Olympic National Park cost $6.50, including three meals. In 1984, that same room -- minus meals -- cost $72.00 per night. Soft-drinks, hot dogs, mule rides and picture postcards have gone up in both cost and sales.

Despite our support for higher entrance fees, we must express some very real concerns. First, we regard the higher entrance fee authority as a very small part of a total rethinking and restructuring of the means by which we fund our federal recreation and conservation programs. Fortunately, the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors is at work on this need at the present time and will be making recommendations by year-end. Among the ideas we hope will be examined are:

(1) Rate setting commission. Establishing entrance and user fees has proven to be politically contentious. Efforts by Interior to raise fees have been attributed to OMB pressures to boost revenues from all sources. Key Congressional figures have expressed opposition to entrance fees for philosophical reasons; others have succumbed to political pressures from small numbers of opponents to higher fees.

One solution might be delegation of fee-setting to a perceived neutral entity, providing a buffer for both Interior and Congress. Precedent is seen in the U. S. Postal Rate Commission.

(2) "Friends of" passport. Americans love their parks and other recreation sites. This love, though, doesn't seem to have adequate political proof. One means to demonstrate to it might be a restructured and repackaged Golden Eagle Passport. Proceeds from the passport (perhaps renamed a Natural Heritage Passport) would be 100% earmarked. Outside groups would be recruited to market the passport, much as hunting licenses are available through non-governmental vendors in many states. Rather than only a wallet card, the passport holder would also be given decals and sew-on badges.

Perhaps the Duck Stamp program offers an analogy; many non-hunters buy stamps.

We also might want to look at added economic inducements to passport holders. Perhaps the passport could reduce campground fees $2 per night for all federal campgrounds -- as well as provide free entrance to gated areas.

(3) Urban park parking fees. In recreation-poor urban areas, federal recreation sites must devote substantial space and management resources to parking lots. In many cases, alternatives to personal cars are reasonably available to reach these areas -- subways, buses, bicycles, foot travel, and more. Use the National Zoo as an example. Access is free, but parking is $3.00 or free to F.O.N.Z. (Friends of the National Zoo). A parallel also exists in the Pacific Northwest; a winter parking permit is required for snowmobilers, cross-country skiers and other winter play enthusiasts. The money pays for parking lot creation and plowing.

(4) Targets for fee collections. Congress may wish to establish targets for fee collections as a percentage of operating costs. OMB has suggested that the national parks should generate 25% of their operating costs, reflecting a conviction that there are public benefits from a park beyond the direct experiences of visitors. Perhaps national targets are too broad; maybe the "big draw" parks can generate 50% of their costs while collections at urban recreation areas will be more limited. Perhaps standards should be established by class of service: campgrounds should recover 100% of costs while interpretive services might recover only 10%.

(5) Matching funds for fees. There is acute and widespread suspicion that new and higher fees will merely displace general revenues appropriated to federal recreation-managing agencies. One mechanism to counter this fear would be a formula for budgets of these agencies based upon fee collections. The National Park Service might be statutorily promised $3 in general revenues (or earmarked monies from commodity program receipts) for every fee dollar collected. This creates an incentive for fees.

(6) Concessions versus partnerships. Perhaps we should consider a new relationship between federal land managing agencies and private entities providing recreational services on federal lands: rather than concessions and permits, we should consider equity partnerships, yielding an economic incentive to federal agencies. An analogy would be commercial office buildings. It is quite common for a partnership to be created between a site owner and a developer, with an equity division based upon asset share. Profits are shared according to this division as are proceeds upon sale of the property. The public interests can be protected by (1) guaranteed right of buy-out by government, for cause or by agreement of partners; and (2) active federal representation in the partnership.

(7) Volunteer programs. There are ways to institutionalize and catalyze "volunteerism" -- perhaps, though, we should consider the issue "involvement" or "participation." We must consider some form of compensation for unpaid work benefitting our public recreation resources, though. Earned Golden Eagle passports are one option, as are other forms of recognition. In addition, we can and should assist the development of non-profit organizations with aid to federal areas as primary objectives, like the Appalachian Trail Conference and its member organizations which are the principal managers of the Appalachian Trail.

(8) Excising the terms "user fees" and "entrance fees." The terms user fees and entrance fees carry negative baggage politically and do nothing to garner popular support. Despite claims that there is a philosophic distinction between the two charges with the Congress, the line is by no means drawn (or of significant concern) in the minds of most recreationists. Technically, Disney collects its fee as an entrance fee - a single fee for a daily pass. Yet this is a change; Disney initially sold a ticket book with coupons for specific rides (Class A, Class B, etc.). Disney concluded that the single entry fee was preferable for several reasons:

- guests were able to select those attractions of interest to them and/or where lines were smallest;
- guests didn't have to face the need to buy additional tickets during the day, and thus feel "nickeled and dimed;" and
- personnel could aid guests rather than collect tickets.

Presently, we are marching toward more and higher fees in our parks and forests. In the face of budget cuts, more and more services will either be abandoned or be made fee-based (sometimes with private parties assuming the role). It is a real possibility that a visitor to a national park in the 1990's will pay an entrance fee, a fee for brochures and maps, a fee for nature walks and campfire chats and charges for campsites and boat launching ramps. We may find, as Disney found, that people would prefer a single, comprehensive charge.

And perhaps people would respond better to a new term which gives a sense that they are contributing to their parks with their payments. Few recreationists describe themselves as "users."

(9) Marketing orders. Under legislation enacted in 1937, nearly 50 agricultural commodity groups have instituted marketing orders under which producers of commodities ranging from eggs to avacados have voluntarily begun a producer tax which is used for R&D, marketing assistance and promotion. The tax is applied

if and only if two-thirds majority of the industry agrees to the program; it is applied to all producers, if approved. Oversight of the program is provided by a representative industry board. Expansion of this concept to the recreation field may boost public-private partnerships and aid in responding to demands arising from new recreation products.

Mr. Chairman, we conclude our testimony with three points:

- First, we urge the National Park Service to insure that the collected fees result in visible services to the visiting public. Acceptance of higher fees will be much, much higher if there is no further deterioration in the interpretive and educational programs at our parks. The new fee revenue should be used creatively, as well. Video tapes of certain interpretive programs should be made, for example, to increase the accessibility of this information.
- Second, specific entrance fee charges need to be carefully considered. An ongoing evolution toward higher fees may be preferable. And the higher fees should not be structured in a way which discourages group travel to the parks on buses. Many of our most popular areas have acute traffic and parking problems. Increased reliance on buses for travel to and within these areas makes more sense.

- Finally, we ask you to excercise an active oversight over the budget of the National Park Service and, through these efforts, work to insure that the suspicions of those who predict dollar cutbacks in general revenues for every new fee dollar are not confirmed.

STATEMENT OF MIKE SCHNEIDER, ON BEHALF OF THE T.L. ENTERPRISES AND THE GOOD SAM CLUB

Mr. **Schneider.** Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity this morning to explain our perspective on proposals to raise user fees in the National Park System. I represent more than 1 million recreational vehicle or RV enthusiasts under the T.L. Enterprises umbrella which includes members of the Good Sam Club and Trailer Life Motor Home magazine.

Before I share with you a summary of our views, first let me give you a brief insight into our members and readers. Our members come from all walks of life, throughout the entire United States. They are hikers and fishermen, square dancers and photographers, boaters and skiers, all of whom are bonded together by their love for the great outdoors and their use of RV's to enjoy those activities and more.

The average age of our members is nearly 60, and more than 50 percent are retired after working a lifetime in diverse backgrounds. Since our membership consists of a majority of retirees, it should come as no surprise that today most of them are also living on some type of fixed income, well over 50 percent in fact.

Recent surveys we have taken also indicate that our members are heavy users of outdoor recreational facilities. An average of 40 nights per year are spent at campgrounds, which includes nearly seven nights in public facilities. Moreover, some 68 percent camped in a public park at some time during this past year.

I would like to tell you this morning that our members wholeheartedly support increases in user fees at the national parks they love so dearly—but I can't, for at least three reasons.

First, no one wants to pay more for services without some additional increase in the quality of services they receive in return.

Second, since many of our members are on fixed incomes, any increase in fees will have some type of an impact on their everyday lives.

Third, our members, most of whom have spent a lifetime working and paying taxes, have an underlying feeling that the Federal lands are their lands and that they have already paid for them during their lives as productive working American citizens.

However, what I can tell you is that our members will support actions taken regarding user fees because they appreciate our public lands and they realize they must pay for services rendered.

They also understand that the fee structure at our park system has not really changed since the early 1970's. So while you have the Good Sam Club's qualified support for a change, it is important that you also understand the following concerns and recommendations we have.

Concurrent with any increase in fees, please make sure that services, security, and facilities are increased proportionately. We hope that any increase will be as small as possible and accompanied with some qualitative increases in our RV benefits.

In short, make sure the American public sees some tangible return in services for any additional money that it will be paying.

Second, coinciding with our recommendation for a visible increase in services, is the feeling among our members that their user fees remain within the park system. They do not want to see a significant portion of the money go to a vague geeneral fund. Instead, the vast majority of those funds should be pinpointed back to the park system, and as much as possible, that money should go directly back to those parks that collected the fees.

In addition, there are a couple other considerations relevant to our groups and all our RV'ers in general that I would like to share with you. Continued developing and supporting programs enable RV Americans to utilize the glorious lands of their country. For example, the Golden Age Passport which has been discussed here earlier is a tremendous way to recognize and support the growing number of senior citizens, many of whom use RV's and belong to the Good Sam Club.

We would like to see any increases here be kept to an absolute minimum as a showing of appreciation to the millions of retirees who have contributed so much to this country.

At the same time, we would like to offer our full support for one such new program, Secretary Hodel's "Take Pride in America" campaign. You can be sure we will do our part in helping get the message out that every citizen should do their part in keeping our national parks and forests clean, safe and a source of pride in our heritage.

Along those same lines, please continue involving our people in the betterment of our national lands. For the past 10 years, thousands of Good Samers became volunteer campground hosts and took some of the burden off Government personnel in public campgrounds.

This year our club headquarters in Agoura, CA, worked with the National Park Service and used our computer system to match up Good Sam volunteers with available campground positions across the country. We care about our parks and we are more than willing to do our share to keep those facilities available, so continue to involve the public land users in the public lands.

In conclusion, I would like to reemphasize that our members stand ready, willing and able to support our National Park System. We understand the need to raise fees and pay our own way when visiting our public lands. However, any increase in entrance fees should be instituted sparingly, perhaps even phased in over time, and should be accompanied by increased services at the parks and the knowledge that the extra money is going back to the park system.

On behalf of the Good Sam Club and Trailer Life and Motor Home magazine, thank you for the opportunity to share our views.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Schneider follows:]

TESTIMONY OF MIKE SCHNEIDER, REPRESENTING TL ENTERPRISES AND THE GOOD SAM CLUB, BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS REGARDING NATIONAL FEES,

June 12, 1986

I. Introduction

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members, ladies and gentlemen: Thank you for the opportunity this morning to explain our perspective on the proposals to raise user fees in the national park system.

My name is Mike Schneider and I represent more than one million recreational vehicle (RV) enthusiasts under the TL Enterprises umbrella, which includes members of the Good Sam Club, and Trailer Life and MotorHome magazines. Before I share with you some of our views on the fee structure in the National Park system, first let me give you a brief insight into our members and readers.

II. Who We Are

Our members come from all walks of life throughout the United States. They are hikers and fishermen, square dancers and photographers, boaters and skiers -- all of whom are bonded together by their love for the great outdoors and their usage of RVs to enjoy those activities and more.

The average age of our members is nearly 60, and more than 50% are retired after working a lifetime in diverse backgrounds covering blue collar jobs, business managerial positions and skilled professions. Since our membership consists of a majority of retirees, it should come as no surprise that today most of them are also living on some type of fixed income.

Recent surveys we have taken also indicate that our members are heavy users of outdoor recreational facilities. An average of 40 nights per year are spent in campgrounds, which includes nearly seven nights in public facilities. Moreover, some 68% camped in a public park at some time during the past year. Indeed, a prime motivation for their enjoyment of the RV lifestyle is the extreme love and appreciation they have for the dozens of spectacular lands under the supervision of the federal government.

III. User Fees

I would like to tell you this morning that our members wholeheartedly support increases in user fees at the national parks they love so dearly. But I can't say that for a few reasons: First, no one wants to pay more for services without some additional increase in the quality of the services they will receive in return; Second, since many of our members are on fixed incomes, any increase in fees will have some type of an impact on their everyday lives; and Third, our members, most of whom have spent a lifetime working and paying taxes, have an underlying feeling that the federal lands are their lands and that they've already paid for them during their lives as productive, working American citizens.

However, what I can tell you is that our members will support actions taken regarding user fees because they appreciate our public lands so greatly and they realize they must pay for services rendered.

And they also understand that the fee structure at our park system hasn't really changed since the early 1970s.

So while you have the Good Sam Club's qualified support for a change, it is imperative that you also understand the following concerns we'd like to share with you:

1. Increase Services

Concurrent with any increase in fees, please make sure that services, security and facilities are increased proportionately. We've heard proposals to change the levels in some places from the present one-to-three dollar range, all the way up to ten dollars. We hope that any increase will be as small as possible, and accompanied with some qualitative increase in RV benefits. In short, make sure the American public sees some tangible return in services for any additional money they'll be paying.

2. Earmark Funds

Coinciding with our recommendation for a visible increase in services, is the feeling among our members that their user fees remain within the park system. They do not want to see a significant portion of the money go to a vague "general fund." Instead, the vast majority of those funds should be pinpointed back to the park system; and as much as possible that money should go directly back to those parks that collected the fees.

These two points -- increased services and segregation of funds -- are our most important concerns in the discussion of increased park fees. In addition, there are other considerations relevant to our groups and RVers in general that I'd like to share with you:

3. Implementing Programs

Continue developing and supporting programs that enable RV Americans to utilize the glorious lands of their country. For example, the Golden Age Passport is a tremendous way to recognize and support the growing number of senior citizens, many of whom use RVs and belong to the Good Sam Club. We'd like to see any increases here be kept to an absolute minimum as a showing of appreciation to the millions of retirees who have contributed so much to our country.

At the same time, we'd like to offer our full support for one such new program: Secretary Hodel's "Take Pride In America" campaign. You can be sure we'll do our part in helping get the message out that every citizen should do their part in keeping our national parks and forests clean, safe and a source of pride in our heritage.

4. Involvement Of Park Users

Along those same lines, please continue involving our people in the betterment of our national lands. For the past ten years, thousands of Good Samers became "Volunteer Campground Hosts" and took some of the burden off government personnel at public campgrounds. This year our Club headquarters in Agoura, California, worked with the National Park Service and used our computer system to match up Good Sam volunteers with available campground positions across the country. We care about our parks and we're more than willing to do our share to keep these facilities available, so continue to involve the public land users in the parks they enjoy so much.

IV. Summation

In conclusion, I'd like to re-emphasize that our members stand ready, willing and able to support our national park system. We understand the need to raise fees and pay our way when visiting our public lands. However, any increase in entrance fees should be instituted sparingly -- perhaps even phased in over time -- and should be accompanied by increased services at the parks and the knowledge that the extra money is going back to the park system.

On behalf of the Good Sam Club, and Trailer Life and MotorHome magazines, thank you for the opportunity to share our views today.

Senator WALLOP. Thank you, Mr. Schneider.
Rex Maughan.

STATEMENT OF REX MAUGHAN, CHAIRMAN, CONFERENCE OF NATIONAL PARK CONCESSIONERS

Mr. MAUGHAN. Thank you, Mr. chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to be here and in behalf of the time I will submit our statement and I will just recap the most salient points.

Being the Chairman of the Conference of National Park Concessioners and representing the 500-odd concessioners in all our national parks, most people come to me and say that I assume you are against raising fees in the National Parks. Contrary to that, I believe and our membership believes that fees are important. I believe that if we pay for something, we have better stewardship of it, we realize the value of it.

As I find in Japan, their philosophy is, the more you pay the better it is. So I think that raising the fees is certainly going to provide them with the knowledge that our parks are dear to us and a great natural resource and that we love them and that we should take care of them. And I think that it will help promote stewardship by increasing them.

I also am president of Forever Living Products which has over 500,000 distributors who are interested in natural products and the natural resource in our country, who visit our parks and love them dearly. As I have talked with them, the people, I find, are very much in favor of increased fees if the fees are returned to the park to be utilized there.

I think that is a very important segment. As we have gone around on the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors and have had thousands of people testify before us, almost without exception, they have all been in favor of increased fees if the money can go back to the parks to enhance them. So I think that is important.

One thing that I feel that we should consider is that in these fees, the fees should not be—if we hit the public with a great fee—if we go from $2 to $10 in 1 year, I think there is a reactionary status of people to that, and I feel like they should be staged and not all brought to that place at once. We have been going along with $2 for years and years, and then all of a sudden to jump to a $10 fee, I think will put some irritation, and as the administration said earlier, could possibly cause a reaction of decreased visitation.

If we could stage those in, if we are going from $2 to $10 and stage that over a 3-year period, I think that it would be very acceptable and we would not have any roars in the public from that. So that would be one recommendation that I would have there.

Also, some of the parks that they have recommended going to $10 on are day use type parks. Now, as brought out earlier, a $10 fee in Yellowstone or Yellowstone and Grand Teton combined, where the average visitor spends 3 or 4 days, is certainly a great bargain.

However, if you are in a park—and I will take another $10 recommended one like Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado, where it is all day use visitation, a large part of it coming from

Denver, a city area where they drive through the park in 1 day, a $10 fee could be considerably higher to them. And I think this should be taken into consideration.

I guess the size of the park and the fees I think should also be looked at, and I do not believe that a small park with a small visitation should have a fee to it where we can reap the benefits of the large parks and we are always talking overuse of those major parks.

So I think that is probably the major things that I would like to see looked into, and I would like to say that we do support the Senate bill and would like to see those modifications to it. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Maughan follows:]

UNITED STATES SENATE

ENERGY & NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

PUBLIC LANDS, RESERVED WATER AND

RESOURCE CONSERVATION SUBCOMMITTEE

TESTIMONY OF

REX MAUGHAN, CHAIRMAN

CONFERENCE OF NATIONAL PARK CONCESSIONERS

ON NATIONAL PARK ENTRANCE FEES

JUNE 12, 1986

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE:

It is my pleasure to appear before you as you consider proposals for increases in the entrance fees for units of the National Park System. As the Chairman of the Conference of National Park Concessioners, the organization of business people serving the public through many visitor services in the National Parks, and as an individual concessioner within the System, I have some views and ideas that should be carefully considered by the Subcommittee.

First, it is apparent to most of us who have worked with the National Park System over the years that it is timely that the Administration and the Congress should be examining the issue of entrance fees. There is no doubt that the matter has been neglected over the years. At some units, no entrance fees have been charged. At others, although a fee is charged, there have sometimes been gaps in the administrative mechanism to collect those fees. Superintendants of National Park units where fees are charged have been pressed by personnel reductions to the point that they have had to choose whether personnel should be assigned at the collection points or assigned other higher priority duties. With none of the fees being designated for maintenance and operations of the National Parks, there has been less than a full commitment toward maximizing the collections.

Secondly, it is also apparent that the present fee structure is one of the last remaining genuine bargains in our nation. Where else could a mother, father and the children enjoy the ultimate in quality scenery and recreation for a fee of two dollars or perhaps slightly higher at some places? Where else could these great national treasures be shared with the American people and our foreign visitors for such a minimum gratuity? The answer is obvious that virtually no where but in the units of the National Park System do such great bargains still exist. The answer is also obvious that in today's economic climate in our nation and with respect to the ever tightening federal government budget, the bargain days must be over soon and a sharp turn to economic reality must take its place.

Perhaps it is unusual for businesses whose entire clientele are visitors to the units of the National Park System to be supportive of increases in entrance fees. After all, there would be more visitors, theoretically, if there were no fees, or at least, lower fees. But that posture for concessioners in the National Park System would be unrealistic and unfair, in the long run, to ourselves and the American public whom we serve.

So, I am here, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, to inform you that the Conference of National Park Concessioners does support reasonable increases in entrance fees, but with some specific suggestions as to their implementation:

1. Any increase in entrance fees, that would more than double the fee should be phased in gradually over a three (3) year period.
2. The setting of the new entrance fees should be guided by the type of use in the unit. For instance, those with no overnight accomodations with only day use, should have lower fees than those where visitors may stay several days at a time.

3. The size of the increase should be guided by the rule that no visitor should be priced out of the opportunity to enjoy our National Parks, but that the fee must bear close relationship to the value of the experience. That is, higher fees may be justified to some extent for the most popular units, but they should never be placed beyond the reach of the average American family's means.
4. The major portion of the fees collected should be earmarked for operation and maintenace in the National Park units. The National Park service should commit that substantial use of these funds will be made to improve and sustain visitor services to those who have paid the fees.

A few comments on the above suggestions may assist in understanding the reasons behind them. It is our belief that the public will more easily and readily accept the increases if they are phased in gradually over an approximate three (3) year period. The extra time will help the public adjust and smooth the transition considerably.

There is a justifiable rationale for increases at nearly every unit but the setting of the new fees should be adjusted in some way to the expected use. The most sensible approach to this is to set lower fees for day use only and higher fees where visitors may stay several days at a time.

While upward adjustments in entrance fees are justified at most units, it would seem most fair to assess higher fees at places of higher visitation and more modest fees at less visited units. However, it should be kept in mind that the access to all units of the National Parks System should be kept within the financial reach of all American families.

One of the most compelling arguments for making the increases and gaining the acceptance by the American people of the decision is that a substantial part of the fee would be retained by the National Park Service for operation and maintenance at the units collecting those fees. Those fees returned will represent a substantial commitment to improve and sustain those services which the visitors deserve, for those are the direct contributors of the fees.

In summary, the Conference of the National Park Concessioners support reasonable increases in entrance fees, conditioned on several suggestions which we believe are essential to their acceptance and support. We commend Interior Secretary Donald P. Hodel and National Park Service Director William Penn Mott for their leadership in this area and to you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Subcommittee, we thank you for your careful consideration of this important matter which will assure the American public of thorough examination of the many facets of this issue if it is adopted.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Senator Wallop. I would like to chat with you about these parks, but as we discovered this morning, the February list is not very up-to-date. We might just be spinning our wheels.

It would be my hope, I guess, to have some kind of a public commentary on individual fee structure. Naturally, I think everybody wants their own park to be the cheapest if they are going to be up there.

Let me ask you this with regard to your phase-in. Are we going to have three miniroars instead of one big roar? You know, in 3 years, well, here they go again. Or are we going to get it in and get it over with?

Mr. Maughan. No, I don't think so because we are used to inflationary measures, and you know every year things go up.

Senator Wallop. Not by three times.

Mr. Maughan. That is why I say if it goes up, I don't think going from $3 to $4 or even $5 would be too bad, but if you go from $2 to $10 you are going to hear screams. There is not any real reason, and my feeling is that we have gone so long at $2, there is no reason we cannot stage it if we are going to go up there. I think $10 is reasonable.

Senator Wallop. Well, there is a reason. And I am not here advocating one thing or the other, but one of the reasons is the urgent need of the money for the Park System to provide that quality of experience, increased quality that Mr. Schneider is talking about.

It is very hard to do much with those smaller dollar figures. I guess that is one of the things you weigh in the balance. Can they forecast themselves into a circumstance which would show fairly immediate response to the fees collected? Or will they not be able to see very much because there isn't very much, and yet they are having another increase?

Mr. Maughan. Well, Mr. Horn indicated earlier that they originally anticipated a 20 percent decrease when they originally came out with it.

Senator Wallop. But that is a figure that they brought out of the sky: there have been a lot things involved in all of this, and that has got to be one of the biggest.

You know, to prove they are being conservative in their revenue estimates, just to terrify everybody. Good God, nobody wants to run 20 percent of American park visitors off. But it is a figure out of the sky. It has absolutely no relationship to anything except somebody's desire to be conservative and satify OMB, and it is killing them. It is utterly stupid.

If they wanted to do a study like that, they had a nice opportunity this summer when there is a forecast increase. They could have had it in a few parks, but Congress in its wisdom turned it down. I guess that is one of the struggles that we are going to have to come to grips with; if the fee increase is substantial in the political arena for any reason, I suppose, maybe it ought to be confronted and done.

Derrick.

Mr. Crandall. Senator, just a comment. I don't think it is at all inconceivable that we could increase the 100,000 annual sales of Golden Eagle Passports up into the several million per annum sales of those Golden Eagle Passports with an appropriate public recognition program to explain where that money is being or will be used.

Of course, there you assist people, because in fact once they write their check out for $40 or whatever the fee would be, they have free access to the National Parks. I think we have adequate evidence here in the Washington area, whether it is the FONZ Program for the National Zoo, or any one of the many other private fundraising efforts that go on to support quasi-public institutions, I think we simply have not provided the American public with a vehicle to express their love of the National Parks.

If dollars are what we are after for a good cause, then I think there are appropriate ways to go about generating that.

Senator Wallop. I appreciate your idea on marketing. Again, I don't think your folks, Mr. Schneider, would object to the one-time Golden Age Passport fee of $10 for the rest of their life.

Mr. Schneider. Probably not. As far as the Golden Eagle Passport that Derrick speaks about, in terms of marketing it and really getting support for the program, perhaps there should be some small token incentive along with that; I mean a little pin or something to show that they belong.

Senator Wallop. Oh, you know, all we do is sit around here and view this thing as some other appropriation process when there really is a public that badly wants to be involved in their National Parks and look for a way.

You can see you have to reach out to them. I agree with you. Those things that they wore at the end of World War II, you know, those "I served" kind of little objects you are talking about.

Well, thank you for taking the time to come here today to let us know of your feelings.

The last group is Mr. Russell Keune, American Institute of Architects; Dr. Philip Speser, Society of American Archaeology, accompanied by Kathleen Reinburg; and Ms. Nellie Longsworth, president of Preservation Action.

Again, each of your statements will be in the record in their entirety.

Mr. Keune.

STATEMENT OF RUSSELL V. KEUNE, AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

Mr. Keune. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have a statement that has been submitted and will treat that as being entered in the record.

I would just like to elaborate on a few points. I am here representing the American Institute of Architects which has had a longstanding relationship with the National Park Service, particularly in its historic preservation and cultural programs.

The institute does support S. 2130. We agree that the entrance fees should be treated as a supplemental. It is imperative that 100 percent of the user fees go back to the National Park Service uses is the position of the AIA. It is very important in our view that if this legislation is passed, that it be enacted as soon as possible within the Park Service System.

I would like to turn the major portion of my personal remarks to the fact that I served as a restoration architect in the National Park Service for ten years, beginning in the Mission 66 period and continuing up through the 1960's.

I am particularly impressed, as a professional who worked within the Park Service, at the specificity of Mr. Durenberger's bill in terms of what it calls for the Park Service to do, as I viewed my responsibilities and activities in cultural resources.

It is particularly of concern to me as an architect who continues to have close association with fellow colleagues who are employed within the National Park Service's Restoration Architects and as a visitor to many of the sites, the eight sites that I worked at during my career, to see that nearly 28 years after I first started in some parks, that there are buildings still standing, unattended from the time that the National Park Service acquired them.

I could go on to list many examples, but several might point out some of these concerns. I recently had a chance to return to San Juan, PR, and was surprised at how little had been done since I left that site in 1961 in terms of substantial restoration projects within that large scale and, I might note, site entered on the World Heritage List.

In 1962 I was involved at the Salem Maritime site when the site acquired one of the important surviving 17th century houses in Salem. Twenty-four years later it is still not open to the public. It is stabilized but not available for public visitation.

I think these are but a few examples of the kinds of concerns that we as architects see around the United States. It was my experience while working in the Park Service that there seemed to be a readiness on the part of Congress to add units to the system, many of which came to the Park Service in a state of exaggerated deferred maintenance, usually because the agency transferring them was really pushing to see them come into the Park Service had long ago stopped spending capital improvement money on sites.

I think there is a ticking time bomb of perhaps international embarrassment dimension if this issue is not dealt with effectively on a timely basis.

Next year the United States will host the first worldwide assembly of the International Council of Monuments and Sites, and I think it behooves the United States, as the first country to endorse and approve the World Heritage Convention, that we treat the many sites that we are now nominating to that Convention Heritage List in a sensitive and professional way.

In that regard, I would just like to suggest in addition to the testimony that has been submitted, two points that I think are important to be added to the bill, and we will submit a further statement in this regard. I think it is important to recognize the availability of international assistance, too, to this effort that the Park Service is hoping to undertake. There certainly are organizations to which Park Service employees are sent for training, such as the International Center for Conservation in Rome, and other organizations throughout the world, that can benefit this effort.

Second, we would like to see a stronger recognition in the bill for the role of architects and architectural conservators and craftsmen as they are adequately trained to undertake these new responsibilities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Keune follows:]

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

National Park System Preservation

A STATEMENT BY

Russell V. Keune, AIA

On Behalf Of

The American Institute of Architects

U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC LANDS, RESERVED WATER AND
RESOURCE CONSERVATION

June 12, 1986

1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 • (202) 626-7300 • CABLE ADDRESS: AMINARCH • TELEX: 710822 1112

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to testify today on behalf of the American Institute of Architects, the professional association representing our nation's architects. I am Russell V. Keune, a member of AIA and its Historic Resources Committee.

As professionals dedicated to design excellence, the Institute's membership has long exhibited a strong commitment to preservation and the mission of the National Park Service. In this spirit, we wish to endorse S. 2130, the "National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986."

Our support for this essential bill stems from two basic observations: the tremendous needs of cultural resource management and preservation within our national parks are not being met, principally because of budgetary shortfalls; and as a result, many of our nation's most prized cultural treasures are being gravely threatened by deferred preservation treatment and maintenance. In some cases, even basic research and evaluation of needs are not being accomplished.

We realize the issue of raising park entrance fees is somewhat controversial, but we also believe that the American public is willing to do more to share in the growing responsibility of protecting and maintaining our parks. If park visitors are assured that these additional fees will be used exclusively to enhance and protect threatened natural and cultural resources, they will not object to paying a fair share for the privilege of visiting. In fact, enhancing preservation efforts and knowledge about resource management should lead to a more satisfying visitor experience and increased public support.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress is to be congratulated for undertaking this effort to improve our National Park System. It's often difficult to commit limited dollars to basic preservation activities, which are usually taken for granted by the public, but without such a commitment, our parks would not survive the increasing threats to their natural and cultural resources.

Hopefully, the massive Park Restoration and Improvement Program (PRIP) recently undertaken by the Congress and the administration proved both the tremendous need and benefit of addressing many serious health and safety problems related to neglected park roads, sewers, and facilities. PRIP also demonstrated that the key to preservation is a timely and continuous infusion of funds. As a 1982 report on threats to cultural resources concluded, consistent care by scheduled and cyclic maintenance in the long run "will be less expensive than the past procedure of letting structures decline and then pouring vast sums of money into them to bring them to a satisfactory level of repair."

Such deferrals, or backlogs of maintenance and repair, are not only expensive, they also place our cultural resources in extreme jeopardy. Unlike the conservationist's theory of "natural regulation" in which natural resources are permitted to run their course within the parks with minimal human interference, cultural resource protection requires a sophisticated level of stabilization, repair and maintenance executed on a continuing basis by highly trained professionals. But like an endangered species, once a cultural resource is gone, its authenticity and possibly even its documentation is lost forever.

The structures and sites in the National Park System are diverse, ranging from Indian ruins to the homes of former presidents. There are also representative parts of the buildings and landscapes of rural America, at a sheep ranch in

Oregon, a dairy farm in California, and farms that date from the original settlement of the land in New Jersey, Arkansas, and Michigan. These disappearing landscapes and their traditional buildings are predominantly in National Recreation Areas or reserves, but only minimally protected by their National Register of Historic Places status. All have in common special recognition of a former time and place and a special preservation need.

We have entrusted the National Park Service with nothing less than America's heritage, and we must continue to support its work in traditional and in new and creative ways. In so doing, we must increase our support for the enormous task of cultural resource protection. To do less is to leave the next generation with less of our heritage than we enjoy today.

Over sixty percent of our national parks are based upon cultural sites and events, and almost every natural resource is also touched by our Native American and European exploration and settlement. By all accounts, we have only begun the planning, treatment and management of our cultural resources. Most parks still await and require such basic documentation as historic resource studies, administrative histories, and collection management plans to enhance management and protection of park resources.

For example, of the over 10,000 prehistoric and historic structures on the List of Classified Structures (LCS) only several hundred have Historic Structure Preservation Guides, and over nine million objects in the Park Service's estimated collection of ten million objects require cataloging to establish basic identification and inventory accountability. Such backlogs deny park visitors full understanding of cultural resources and jeopardize the Park Service's ability to manage its affairs.

As another example, preliminary results from a survey of park resource management plans gathered by the National Parks and Conservation Association reveal that the inventory of prehistoric and historic buildings in 211 system parks presently requires over $150 million of additional preservation assistance. Reports from the field confirm a wide array of unmet needs, ranging from completing work on the Old Faithful Inn to structural repairs at Fort Laramie to preservation of the structures at Edison National Historic Site. In sum, the current program funding level for Cultural Resources Management cannot now meet emergency and essential stabilization and is far short of the estimated annual requirement to eliminate present backlogs for preservation treatments and maintenance to meet future cultural resource obligations.

In our estimation, the Park Service is immensely qualified to undertake such tasks. Its ability is marked by the inspiration of its new director William Penn Mott, Jr. At his direction, the Park Service has prepared a challenging twelve point management plan for the National Park System. At the top of the list is the development of "a long-range strategy to protect our national, cultural, and recreational resources."

Unfortunately, the lack of trained staff and particularly, hard-to-find historical architects, preservation technicians and experienced trade mechanics, is a key problem in reaching this objective. Many of the difficulties in preserving cultural resources could be solved or mitigated by increasing the number of cultural resource professionals and para-professionals hired to identify problems, devise solutions, and train others to do the same. In effect, we are asking the Park Service to manage 15,000 years of native American habitation, over 10,000 historic and prehistoric structures, over ten million objects in park collections, and a geographic area over twice the size of England with fewer people than it takes to run a large amusement park.

Against the odds, the Park Service has had some remarkable successes in preserving our cultural heritage. Perhaps the most dramatic modern success story is the preservation of the Skagway, Alaska historic district. At the Park Service's direction, Skagway's depot complex, which was donated by the railroad, has been restored and is used as a visitor center and showplace for the gold rush park. Other buildings are being restored and will be adaptively used by the private sector under the historic leasing program.

Skagway represents how trained architects, working closely with other professionals and committed citizens, can fight the adversity of structural decline, adverse working conditions, and limited resources to preserve one of the most colorful pages in America's history. As the articles which I would like to submit for the record describe, Skagway's preservation represents living history through architecture. As one of the authors states, "Past and present survive because of each other. Now thanks to the joint restoration project of the Park Service and the community, the future is being ensured as well."

With dedication and innovation, the Park Service has managed to maintain the quality of its service amid the increased use and expections of the public and the difficulties of budget deficits. Fortunately, the Congress has continued its loyal support for our National Park System. As Senator McLure has stated, "I do not think that current budget concerns should be an excuse to subordinate proper management of the resources of the National Parks to economics." We certainly agree.

The Park Service has pledged that their "management decisions will give focus and guidance to assure research efforts meet critical needs." But frankly, the Service receives many Nationally significant sites and structures that are in advance states of deterioration: Ellis Island, Ft. Hancock, New Jersey, and the ships in San Francisco, by example. When these areas were authorized, the expectations were high for preservation, but the huge sums for recapitalizing these assets have not been available. Because of the impacts of normal aging, heavy visitor use and environmental conditions, cultural resources require this additional funding, as well as professional diligence to protect their fragile condition and to unlock their cultural significance.

If visitors are given the satisfaction of knowing that all of their contributions are directly and supplementally benefiting the parks they visit, ~~they will surely~~ support the Congress' decision to increase fees for the first time since 1972. And if these additional resources allow the Park Service to do, as they desire, a "better job of education and interpretation, resource management, and improved maintenance," they will be funds well spent.

As park writer Paul Schulberg has said, "the cultural system can never be completed as long as we continue to elect Presidents, fight wars, and otherwise lengthen our national memory. . .This country possesses no better set of instructors than the many, diverse units of the National Park System." These are history lessons we must all learn, and as concerned citizens, ones we should never forget.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

1986 JUN 23 AM 9:17

June 19, 1986

The Honorable Malcolm Wallop, Chairman
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Reserved
Water, and Resource Conservation
Committee on Energy and National Resources
U.S. Senate
308 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Wallop:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of S. 2130 the "National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986."

For the record, AIA suggests several additional points be added to S. 2130.

- Sec. 2 "Findings" - We recommend the addition of language which recognizes that natural and cultural properties administered by the NPS have been entered on the World Heritage List created by the World Heritage Convention.
- Sec. 6 "Monitoring and Research" - We recommend that section 6 (2) (c) (3) be modified as follows "...and other international, Federal, State..." We believe the cultural programs of the NPS do and will continue to benefit from international cultural and technical experience.
- Sec. 7 "Staffing and Training" - We recommend that section 7 (3) be modified as follows "...research scientists, architects and architectural conservators..."

Once again, thank you for your interest and support. Please call upon us whenever we may be of service.

Sincerely,

Hershel Lipow

Hershel Lipow, Director
Government Affairs

1735 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006 • (202) 626-7300 • CABLE ADDRESS: AMINARCH • TELEX: 710822 1112

Senator WALLOP. Thank you, Mr. Keune.

Dr. Speser.

STATEMENT OF DR. PHILIP SPESER, SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY: ACCOMPANIED BY KATHLEEN REINBURG, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY

Dr. SPESER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

As this committee has always been a good friend to archeology and also in light of the time, I am going to do my best to be uncharacteristically brief.

First of all, let me begin by noting that archeology and the Park Service has a long history of frienship. In fact, we note with pride that there is a little arrowhead on the insignia of the Park Service and we are great arrowhead collectors.

Second, the SAA can support park entrance fee increases only where they are moderate in amount, are directed to activities and programs which would not otherwise occur under Federal appropriations, and finally are 100 percent directed back into the park.

Third, as the testimony highlights, we see the need for some kind of legislation as pressing because of the increased usage that is coming from visitor pressure on the park. From an archeological standpoint, this is both good and bad. It is good because more users mean there are more people to share in the enjoyment and the excitement of archaeology. It is bad because it creates a pressure on the resource and this pressure is seen in two particular ways. One is we have dramatic increases in looting, and second we have overenthusiastic responses like people idly collecting—or, as one archeologist put it, you can imagine what the damage is from 10,000 Nikes running across a site, trying to get a better look.

So we do see a bill like S. 2130 as providing funds that would allow us to do things such as create a inventory of archeological resources in the park so we know what it is. In fact, we are trying to protect but also make enforcement of ARPA and other antilooting legislation easier. It would allow us to monitor user environmental stress on sites and make sound conservation archeology possible.

We are in kind of a fortunate situation in that often in archeology the best thing you can do is just leave things in the ground until you are ready to study them.

So let me conclude. We oppose S. 2204 and we would support S. 2130.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Speser follows:]

society for american archaeology
Office of Public Affairs
2000 P Street, NW, Suite 305, Washington, DC 20036 (202) 833-2322

Testimony of the Society for American Archaeology
Presented to the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Reserved Water and Resource Conservation

June 12, 1986

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the Society for American Archaeology (SAA) is pleased to have this opportunity to testify before you today on the question of increased entrance fees for National Parks.

The SAA is deeply committed to protecting this nation's cultural and historic resources. There are millions of acres of public lands within the 334 National Parks. Each of these parks contains archaeological sites. In the Southwestern United States it is estimated that there are 1.5 million archaeological sites. Without proper resource management plans, programs and funding these valuable resources will be lost. It is a saddening fact, but once they are gone they are lost forever. These losses are a result of looting, vandalism, natural deterioration and erosion.

The two bills under consideration today, S. 2130 "The National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986" and S. 2204 "The National Park System Entrance Fee Act of 1986" both make provisions for increases in fees for National Parks but there are major differences in these acts.

What S. 2204 Would Do

The SAA opposes S. 2204 "The National Park System Entrance Fee Act of 1986". This legislation would increase existing park entrance fees and establish fees in those parks without fees. The revenue resulting from these fees would replace federal appropriations for park operations. Only 80% of these fees would be channeled back to the parks. The other 20% would be directed to reducing the federal deficit.

The SAA feels that it is not acceptable for fees to be increased in order to replace federal appropriations for park operations, including cultural resource management and preservation. Since 1916 the federal government has supported the National Park System. This support is a federal obligation and must continue. In addition, the fee structure in S. 2204 is too high. It will discourage frequent users, school groups, families, senior citizens, indeed, most visitors.

What S. 2130 Would Do

We support S. 2130 "The National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986". The National Park Service should be the model land manager in interpretation, public education, outreach and resource protection and this bill will help the Park Service fulfill that role.

SOCIETY FOR AMERICAN ARCHAEOLOGY

With the emphasis on vacationing in this country this year, the parks are facing an increase in visitors. For archaeologists this is both good and bad. More visitors means more people will have a chance to share in the excitement of archaeology. Yet, these park users will create resource pressures which have never before been experienced. Without adequate education and law enforcement, looting, vandalism, and deterioration related to these increases in park visitors can cause major damage. Without comprehensive archaeological research and interpretation programs to deal with these pressures many valuable resources will be destroyed.

How will S. 2130 help address major problems in federal archaeology in the National Park System?

First, it would provide the necessary funds to address many of most pressing resource management problems. All park managers would be required to develop a comprehensive resource management plan and update these every five years. These plans would include inventory of significant resources, identification of current and potential resource management problems, and development of responses to these problems. The 100 most critical problems would be addressed yearly with $12 million provided by these fees. For example, a comprehensive inventory of significant resources will help make better protection of archaeological resources possible by establishing what it is we, in fact, are protecting.

Second, resource managers would develop independent research capabilities within each park unit and set up 10 pilot research monitoring projects. The purpose of this is to strengthen the unique research possibilities within each individual park. It would also establish uniform information collection standards for use by park managers. The fee schedule would allow $12 million yearly to focus on research and resource monitoring. This funding would let us monitor user and environmental stresses on sites and make sound conservation archaeology possible.

Third, the NPS would establish and maintain a mandatory resource management training center and a continuing education program in resource management. This will enable quality assurance in personnel and stimulate career advancement. It would clearly benefit the internal archaeological programs of the Park Service. It could also help the external programs fulfill the Secretary's responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act and other legislation.

Fourth, a biennial report assessing the condition of park resources, possible remedies, funding and legal authority would be issued by the Secretary of Interior. This information is vital for Congressional oversight. It also would ensure that the public has an opportunity to applaud or deplore the stewardship of our National Parks.

Fifth, it has been estimated that up to $50 million/year will be generated over the next ten years. These funds will come from moderate increases in entrance fees and the Golden Eagle Pass. These revenues will be 100% directed back into the parks. We believe that Americans will be glad to help support our parks when they know their fees are really going to the parks.

Conclusion

Each generation of Americans views its parks differently. Increased usage is a sign our parks are still special to us today. But increased usage brings its own problems.

Modest entrance fees, devoted entirely to new activities and progress can stimulate creative responses to the challenges of increased use. Archaeological and other cultural resources, like natural resources, can benefit from responsible, innovative experiments. S. 2130 can provide the funds and authority to make these experiments possible.

To reiterate, the SAA can support park entrance fee increases only if they are moderate in amount, are directed to activities and programs which would otherwise not occur under federal appropriations, and are 100% directed back into the parks.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify today.

Senator WALLOP. Thank you, Dr. Speser.
Ms. Longsworth.

STATEMENT OF NELLIE L. LONGSWORTH, PRESIDENT, PRESERVATION ACTION

Ms. LONGSWORTH. Thank you very much.

I am delighted to testify, even if I am the last to testify, and the only analogy I can make is that occasionally when I go to visit some of the National Parks, I think that some of the historic structures in the park are also the last in competition and priority for the National Park Service dollar.

And I speak specifically. I have had experiences such as Russell has noted, and recently I was in a National Park where they had dug big holes in the side of a building to put in air-conditioners; they were lovely historic buildings. So I think sometimes there has been very little sympathetic concern about some of the historic buildings in the Park Service System.

Sixty percent of the 337 National Parks are classified primarily as historic. Now, our organization has been concerned about historic preservation of structures for a number of years. We have been actively lobbying and I am sure you know that there have been tax incentives since 1976 for commercial revitalization or rehabilitation of historic buildings.

We have learned a great deal through that about what you can do to buildings, how they can work, and our concern now is not so much about those commercial buildings, even though we are concerned about retaining those credits in tax reform, but our concern is really public buildings which don't qualify for funds such as that and many of the buildings in the park that we are extremely concerned about.

We are really quite pleased to see something of the scope of S. 2130 because we feel that there are two things we would like to highlight. I am not going to get into the fee thing because I agree with everthing that has been said by most people about returning the fees.

But I think that we do have to come up with more of a plan for the historic buildings within the parks. I think we need to think of maintenance, ongoing maintenance, cyclical maintenance. I think we need to look carefully at the restoration and rehabilitation needs, but I think we also have to look at crisis maintenance. What happens when there are fires, when there are floods, that affect these historic structures?

I think, as Russell has said, that there is a need for more historians, more architectural historians, people who have a knowledge of the techniques that really make preservation quite easy. If nothing else, these tax incentives have taught us a lot about how to preserve, what are better methods, what are most cost-effective methods, and those things, I think we should be passing on.

Second, nobody in testimony today has mentioned something which I thought was really quite a nice item in S. 2130, and that was the idea of a matching grants program. It shows up there as a $2 million program, but we have seen from our experience with the Historic Preservation Fund that matching grants can be a very significant way to attract, as this bill says, local and State government, the private sector, colleges, universities and nonprofit organizations.

I think there is an area to explore here that broadens the whole aspect of people participating in preservation of historic buildings in the park. I think if people are concerned about these buildings not being done, then I think people should have an opportunity, and I think maybe this would be one of the things that could be attractive to getting something like this going.

I would like to say that I am delighted to testify. I am really quite pleased with the progress I see moving on this situation that shows up in S. 2130, and find that definitely preferable to that which the administration has offered.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Longsworth follows:]

PRESERVATION
Action

TESTIMONY OF NELLIE L. LONGSWORTH
PRESIDENT OF PRESERVATION ACTION
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, RESERVED WATER, & RESOURCE CONSERVATION
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
JUNE 12, 1986

Chairman Wallop and Members of the Subcommittee:

I am Nellie L. Longsworth, President of Preservation Action, the national citizens lobby for historic preservation and neighborhood conservation issues. Preservation Action is a non-profit membership organization and is supported by preservation groups, individuals, and corporations throughout the nation concerned about our historic and cultural resources. We have developed an effective grassroots lobbying network which has actively focused on the retention of the rehabilitation investment tax credits in the tax reform package and the continued appropriation of the National Historic Preservation Fund. The latter is a most cost-effective program expenditure that has created an excellent partnership between the National Park Service, state preservation offices and the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Preservation Action has been involved in lobbying for historic preservation issues since 1975. The success of our efforts is visible in the exciting revitalized historic areas that dot the cities and towns of all 50 states, where just ten years ago there were skeleton buildings in an environment of blight, neglect, and degradation. We take pride in the 11,600 commercial structures that have been revitalized using the rehabilitation investment tax credits, representing over $8 billion of private investment.

We are equally concerned that only commercial historic buildings are eligible for these tax incentives, and that many, especially public buildings, are being neglected as public dollars flow into other more compeling community needs. Our concern extends to the national park system - since 60% of the 337 park units are classified as primarily historic - and in many cases, the buildings and cultural resources are a low priority in the competition for the federal "park" dollar.

Buildings, sites, and traditions within the national parks contribute significantly to the "park experience" and need "better care and feeding" on a cyclical as well as long-term basis if they are to survive. It is therefore with great excitement that we join in support of S 2130: the National Park System Resource Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986, a most timely piece of legislation that will bring public and private sectors together to improve the natural and cultural resources within our parks.

Preservation Action is pleased that the resource protection program proposed by S 2130 brings together both natural and cultural concerns into a single approach that will enhance the total park system. Historically we have found that the protection of natural resources and the protection of cultural resources must sometimes be accomplished in the private sector through diametically different methods. However, when the resources coexist in a national park, it makes sense to adopt a wholistic approach to their protection, as proposed in the Preservation 95 legislation. We do believe it is critical to the success of this approach that 20 years of professional experience and methodology in dealing with the preservation of historic and pre-historic resources be reflected in program administration, management, and personnel. In short, preservation of buildings and sites requires expertise that is beyond the training of park personnel.

We applaud the concept of resource management plans for each unit of the National Park System. Taking a parochial view that again reflects 20 years of experience with preservation activity, we would like to stress the need for including the expertise of preservation professionals - including architectural historians - among those responsible for plans that must incorporate maintenance of buildings and sites on three levels: cyclical maintenance, restoration and rehabilitation, and finally, crisis maintenance following such occurrences as flood, fire, or other disasters. Cayahoga National Park is a fine example of a park unit that employs a well-qualified architectural historian and thereby, has become a park where there is excellent work currently being undertaken to restore structures in a cost-effective manner that employs the best preservation techniques available. The architectural historian profession should be integrated into the whole management approach as well as into the training component envisioned in this legislation.

We also applaud the $2 million matching grant proposal set up to encourage partnerships between park personnel, local governments, colleges and universities, and non-profits as a means of finding innovative approaches to preservation, revitalization, research, and monitoring activities. Community and National Park cooperation is exciting and is already at work in many locales throughout the nation. None is more successful than the Lowell National Park experience in Massachusetts. Here one can observe a wide variety of incentives and innovative programs at work, with the private sector working in harmony with state and local governments as well as the National Park Service.

Another matching grant program - the National Historic Preservation Fund grants-in-aid for acquisition and development - further makes the case that small grants can have a great impact. This program is credited with changing a long held national perception that "new and bigger was better" by proving that older buildings are beautiful and useful in the '70s and '80's.

The National Park Service must be complimented for 70 years of outstanding service to the citizens of our nation. Interest in visitation to the parks increases yearly, placing tremendous demands on the resources within the system. S 2130 is a timely bill that will relieve the competition for funds that presently exists through the proposed simplified system of financing and operating cultural resource management. The 10 year plan is a creative one, relying on visitors fees that will flow directly back to the Park Service for this cultural resource program.

A program of this magnitude is needed as desperately during our difficult budget years as it would be during easier times. The interpretation and protection of park resources must begin immediately, as delays only increase the vulnerability and demise of historic and prehistoric sites and structures. The recycling of fees for resource protection is reminiscent of the rationale behind the successful National Historic Preservation Fund itself, where the fees collected from nonrenewable resource use are used to protect our natural and historic "renewable" resources. Americans would take pride in the fact that their visits to the national parks would contribute to the proper management of natural and cultural resources for now and future generations.

Senator WALLOP. Let me suggest that there is a problem with the idea, for example, of matching grants. We have also heard innumerable people—not innumerable because it has not been that big a hearing—a number of the ones who have gone before you, saying that the real purpose or the real means by which you get public support for this is to make certain that it stays all within the Park Service.

As I listen, there are a lot of ways to spend this money and we are only talking about a relatively small amount of money.

Dr. SPESER. Senator, I would like to address the matching grants issue in that light. Let me take off my SAA hat and put on another hat. I live in this area and about a month ago, a little more than a month ago, the Park Service announced it was going to mothball Glen Echo Park.

I happen to be a person that takes a modern dance class down there, and somehow I got wrapped up in this, and all of a sudden I find myself as the chairman of the committee to save Glen Echo Park. I am pleased to say that right now——

Senator WALLOP. That is a modern dance.

Dr. SPESER. Yes, it really is [Laughter.]

And let me tell you, politics on the local level is a lot more confusing than on the national level.

We have a task ahead of us. We have to raise somewhere between $2.5 and $10 million to keep the Park Service from basically mothballing a good deal of that park because it is just deteriorating.

A matching grant program would be a major benefit to us when we went out to try to get corporations and other large donors in there because it would indicate that the Park Service is not simply trying to get out of its responsibilities because of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings pressures.

Ms. LONGSWORTH. I would also like to add that I do not think a matching grant in lieu of appropriation—in other words, I am talking about one aspect. I am talking about the historic structures and the historic sites within the parks; that that may be one of the ways to deal with that.

I like the idea of a $2 million out of a $50 million total program that was calling for resource, research management and everything else, and I do not think it can be shifted to a matching grants program. But I think there are things that have been learned and techniques that could encourage people, as Phil says, to become more involved from the outside.

Senator WALLOP. That is not outside the concept of the administration's approach. I am not talking about the administration's bill. Director Mott's concept pretty well focused on the same kinds of ultimate goals.

Dr. SPESER. I should clarify that we found that the Park Service has been very supportive of our efforts to support Glen Echo Park. I do not want to indicate there is any opposition going on there.

Senator WALLOP. I have some recent reason, as you know, Dr. Speser, getting overly burdened by the bureaucracy, even of one as generally responsive as the Park Service. We have been trying to get Wyoming's archeologist, Dr. Frisson, to be the one sort of in charge of the archeological excavations at the end of Jackson Lake during a period of low water. We find that the bureaucratic structure has stuck us with the region's archeologist in Nebraska.

I am not saying that they have no lack of competence there, but it was done solely for bureaucratic reasons. And the rigidity that builds in there, that is one of the reasons that while you celebrated the specificity in the Durenberger bill—and I understand why—it is one of the reasons I am a little hesitant to embrace it in total because somewhere in there we need the flexibility to do things (a) more cheaply, if that can be done as competently in budget structures like this.

So I would hope maybe you might help me as we examine the various provisions of these things, all of you, to see where it is necessary to be so specific that we get a job done and where in pursuit of that job we don't make it either more expensive or less possible to accomplish.

It is not an easy thing when everybody has their hundreds of ideas as to how to spend this money already. The Good Sam Club wants more security and more visible campgrounds, understandably. Everybody's need in parks is understandable. It is just not all fundable. We have to get some priorities down within this, but they ought to be priorities that can move as time moves.

I mean, as you satisfy certain needs of today, other needs will emerge tomorrow, and I do not think this ought to be that we necessarily have to go back and change the legislation to accomplish that. It takes time, and then this place gets all involved in its own vanity and its own constituency. Depending on who sits where at any given moment, much of the flexibility that is necessary is bound up in that as well.

So kind of keep that in mind if you wouldn't mind, and perhaps even comment further before we get to the markup, which is going to be a little while. Perhaps you know others who would care to add to this record which remains open now for 2 weeks past this.

I really appreciate, though, Mr. Keune, your concerns about the Massachusetts house that still remains unopened, and I am a little concerned about the this morning's statement of Director Mott that they hope they might get two new parks on line, and yet they are still talking about level funding which means a decline in funding, frankly.

I mean it is true of the system. I have a got a lot of problems with Congress's appetite for parks but their lack of stomach for funding the process. We would quite willingly embrace anybody's ideas of what ought to enter the National Park Service. We are very reluctant funders of either the purchase of it, so the Park Service can go to work on it, or the restoration or maintenance of it, once we have it.

This may be some small thing. I also want to ask you and others who have testified as to how we can protect it from entering into the spectrum of level funding. I am not quite certain how to do that, but would like to try. There is no way we can bind a future Congress, but at least we could give some guidelines to the process.

We might tend to indicate that in view of the fact that funding that is in existence today is barely adequate, that job remains to be done.

Anyway, thank you all very much. I appreciate it.

[Whereupon, at 12:22 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to Additional Committee Questions

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
P.O. BOX 37127
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20013-7127

Your
National Park Service
Reminds You. . .

"TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA"

IN REPLY REFER TO:
L58(180)

JUN 23 [illegible]

Honorable Malcolm Wallop
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Reserved Water, and Resource Conservation
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Wallop:

In response to your letter of June 18, enclosed are answers to the additional questions for the National Park Service in connection with the hearing on S. 2130 and S. 2204, which were submitted by Senator Bill Bradley.

We appreciate the opportunity to supplement our testimony.

Sincerely,

Denis P. Galvin
for William Penn Mott, Jr.
Director

Enclosure

ANSWERS TO SENATOR BILL BRADLEY QUESTIONS ON FEE LEGISLATION

QUESTION: Don't you agree that we should not try to run our parks as businesses, where "what the traffic will bear" is a decision rule for setting fees?

ANSWER: Yes, it has never been our goal to charge "what the traffic will bear". Under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act the two primary factors for setting recreation fees have been comparability with the private sector to prevent unfair competition and the direct and indirect cost to the government. While we have applied these criteria to user fees such as camping, tours, etc., the legislative freeze on entrance fees has prevented us from doing the same in this area. Enabling the National Park Service to apply the criteria for entrance fees would only return the users' contribution to park operating costs to the 1972 level of 10 percent of operating costs.

QUESTION: What about the earmarking of funds? Isn't it a reasonable concern that earmarking funds to stay in the park where they're collected will create a system of "haves" and "have-nots"?

ANSWER: We believe our proposal will be equitable, benefitting both collecting and non-collecting parks. Under our proposed distribution of funds, $44.8 million of the $59 million, or 76 percent will be distributed through servicewide programs such as for park brochures and for the cost of collecting. Of the remaining $14.2 million, $7.1 million is distributed to all parks on the basis of their FY 87 budget. This leaves $7.1 million or 12 percent being returned to the collecting areas.

QUESTION: Would you agree that setting reasonable fees requires some discrimination between parks? How would you attempt to ensure fairness and efficiency?

ANSWER: In order to insure fairness and efficiency in this fee program, we developed a formula using the criteria provided in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. Each area of the system was graded according the formula and placed in one of the four fee levels. Attached is a detailed explanation of how the criteria were applied.

QUESTION: Could you comment on the problems associated with collecting fees at:

multi-access parks
urban parks

ANSWER: Under the formula, multi-access parks are evaluated according to the feasibility of collecting the fee. An example of a multi-access park that would lend itself to a historic Williamsburg type system, would be Independence National

Historical Park. Those wishing to enter the buildings, take part in interpretive tours and services would purchase a pass at the visitor center. Those wishing to simply walk on the grounds, or view the Liberty Bell, would pay no fees. In other areas, collecting entrance fees may not be practical at this time. Virtually all urban recreation areas are multi-access in nature.

QUESTION: What is your reaction to the "fee-free day" proposal that is part of Senator Durenberger's legislation?

ANSWER: We would have no objection to a "fee-free day" in areas where a fee is shown to limit low income users.

QUESTION: What assurance do we have that the increased revenues from fees doesn't lead to a decline in park appropriations--perhaps on a dollar--for--dollar basis?

ANSWER: Our propsosal would require that 20 percent of all fees be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. This would constitute our contribution to deficit reduction, and we would expect that the Office of Management and Budget and the Appropriations Committees of Congress will take our contribution into consideration when they establish our operating budgets.

APPENDIX B
APPLICATION OF THE FEE DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

The entry fee criteria are based upon the six legislative criteria stated in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, Public Law 88-578. and also articulated in the GAO Report To The Congress entitled "Increasing Entrance Fees--National Park Service". These criteria and their accompanying point-scoring values as determined by the study team's entrance fee rating model are as follows:

1. **The direct and indirect cost to the government criterion** is based upon the projected FY86 operations budget for the parks.

Points	Determining factors
3	Annual operational budget in excess of $1 million
2	Annual operational budget between $.5 and $1 million
1	Annual operational budget less than $.5 million

*** Based on FY86 budget figures

2. **The visitor benefits criterion** is based upon two marketing principles:

a. Depth of experience provided: (1) A single focus park indicates that the park has one major theme or activity use, and is typically used by the visitor for a half day or less. (2) A multi-focus park indicates that the park has a variety of different activities available to the visitor. Visitors typically spend the entire day involved in either a variety of activities or a single type of activity that is so broad or far-reaching in scope that it takes a full day or more to experience.

1	Primarily a single focus park
2	Multi focus park

b. Cost per visit is the cost to the government to provide the service on a per-person basis.

Points	Determining factors
-1	Cost per visit less than $2
0	Cost per visit between $2 and $5
0	Cost per visit not known
1	Cost per visit between $5 and $10
2	Cost per visit over $10

*** Based on FY86 budget and FY84 visitation figures and was, used in only extremely unique situations. As opposed to the issues of national policy (criterion 4), this criterion is to be used to offset a total score that has been obviously distorted because of very unusual circumstances. Two examples would be:

a. A park where visitation was extremely low (resulting in a high cost per visit ratio) because of being closed for an extended period due to hurricane or fire damage.

b. A new park unit whose operational budget is high and visitation is low because of the costs of extra staff for land acquisition or historical research.

Points	Determining Factors
+2 to -2	Extremely unique situations administratively determined to effectively render the overall criteria as invalid and in need of adjustment

6. **The economic and administrative feasibility of fee collection criterion** was utilized in a very straight-forward manner: Either it is feasible to collect entrance fees or it is not. Although the criterion is straight-forward, its application may not be. Part of the reason for this confusion is that its application in many cases is based upon the traditional concept that entrance fees can only be collected at an entrance gate. This study categorically rejects this notion. There are literally hundreds of examples of non-federal areas where it is common practice to charge entrance fees and to require patrons to come to a visitor center or other central location to purchase their entrance tickets. Some of these examples are ski areas, several Canadian parks, and numerous historic sites. Other non-entrance fee examples which follow this same philosophy are out-of-state daily fishing permits, our own back-country camping permits, and lock-box parking areas.

Points	Determining Factors
x1	Fee collection economically and administratively feasible.
x0	Fee collection not economically or administratively feasible

*** The sub-total of the first five criteria are multiplied by 1 if fee collection is feasible or by 0 if fee collection is not feasible.

3. **The comparable fees charged by non-federal public agencies criterionis** based upon the projected cost of what a vehicle with 3.2 persons (standard number of visitors per vehicle) would expend for a similar experience in the surrounding/representative geographic area. This criterion is similar to the current requirements used in determining campground and park housing fees. For historic sites and recreational areas, in most cases, comparable costs are quite easily derived from surrounding similar state and private sites. For natural areas, the uniqueness of the site was the determining factor in the context of the geographical area. For those areas which have been recognized on an international basis -- such as World Heritage Sites and Biosphere Reserves, and areas whose uniqueness draws large numbers of international visitors -- the geographical area was determinied to be the world. For these parks, comparable costs were determined from commensurate costs for similar experiences on a worldwide basis. Areas of lesser significance were rated accordingly:

Points	Determining factors
-2	Comparables less than $2
0	Comparables between $2 and $5
0	No comparbility possible
1	Comparables between $5 and $10
2	Comparables over $10

4. **The public policy or interest served criterion** was the most subjective, philosophically complex, and politically sensitive of all the criteria. It should be, and was applied with the widest possible input of various public officials. In the 103 current or proposed entrance fee parks, this criterion was deemed non-appropriate to use. Examples of where highest level management may wish to exercise this criterion are:

   a. Negative points: Symbolically sensitive areas such as: The Statue of Liberty; the White House; and, the Lincoln Memorial.

   b. Negative points: Urban recreation areas located in and heavily utilized by very low income visitors.

   c. Positive points: Areas where the low cost of operation and high use rate rusults in a total score, and resultant per visit cost which is less than that currently being charged.

   d. Positive points: An area where projected revenue would be five or six times the cost to the government to operate the park.

Points	Determining Factors
0 to -7	Based upon estalished norms for the relationship of the park to its place in the National cultural and natural heritage of the Nation.

5. **The other pertinent factors criterion** is another criterion that should be,

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PROPOSED ENTRANCE FEE AREAS--BY FEE AMOUNT

	PARK	REG	VISITS 85	VEHICLES 85	85 FEE	85 ENT REVENUE	87 FEE	FEE TYPE PERS	VEH	87 REVENUE
1	BIG BEND NP	SW	188,045	58,764	$0.00	$0	$10.00		1	$235,056
2	EVERGLADES NP	SE	697,646	218,014	$2.00	$162,223	$10.00		1	$872,058
3	GLACIER NP	RM	1,603,011	500,941	$2.00	$195,731	$10.00		1	$782,924
4	GRAND CANYON NP	W	2,711,529	847,353	$2.00	$896,652	$10.00		1	$3,389,411
5	GRAND TETON NP	RM	1,334,483	417,026	$2.00	$265,739	$10.00		1	$1,062,956
6	MESA VERDE NP	RM	656,271	205,085	$2.00	$184,086	$10.00		1	$820,339
7	MOUNT RANIER NP	PNW	1,165,640	364,263	$2.00	$257,231	$10.00		1	$1,457,050
8	ROCKY MOUNTAIN NP	RM	2,248,854	702,767	$2.00	$119,747	$10.00		1	$478,988
9	YELLOWSTONE NP	RM	2,226,159	695,675	$2.00	$487,127	$10.00		1	$1,948,508
10	YOSEMITE NP	WR	2,831,952	884,985	$3.00	$1,456,847	$10.00		1	$3,539,940
			------------			-----------				------------
			15,663,590			4,025,383				14,587,230
			14.5%			56.7%				28.2%
1	ACADIA NP *	MA	3,745,570	1,170,491	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$2,060,157
2	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND NS *	MA	2,304,906	720,283	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$440,566
3	BANDELIER NM	SW	238,434	74,511	$1.00	$28,571	$5.00		1	$149,021
4	BRYCE CANYON NP	RM	500,782	156,494	$2.00	$135,783	$5.00		1	$312,989
5	CANYONLANDS NP	RM	541,315	169,161	$1.00	$42,390	$5.00		1	$338,322
6	CAPE COD NS *	MA	4,374,799	1,367,125	$1.00	$135,377	$5.00		1	$541,508
7	COLONIAL NHP *	MA	2,138,188	668,184	$2.00	$110,063	$5.00		1	$220,125
8	COLORADO NM *	RM	319,248	99,765	$1.00	$17,856	$5.00		1	$99,530
9	CRATER LAKE NP	PNW	390,604	122,064	$2.00	$112,817	$5.00		1	$244,128
10	DEATH VALLEY NM	W	576,679	180,212	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$360,424
11	DINOSAUR NM	RM	418,187	130,683	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$261,367
12	FORT LARAMIE NHS	RM	81,531	25,478	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$50,957
13	FORT UNION NM	SW	13,362	4,176	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$8,351
14	HAWAII VOLCANOES NP	W	816,652	255,204	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$510,408
15	ISLE ROYALE NP	MW	16,775	N/A	$0.00	$0	$5.00	1		$33,550
16	JOSHUA TREE NM	W	641,172	200,366	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$400,733
17	LASSEN VOLCANIC NP	W	451,497	141,093	$1.00	$78,931	$5.00		1	$282,186
18	LAVA BEDS NM	W	68,254	21,329	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$42,659
19	PETRIFIED FOREST NP	W	736,659	230,206	$1.00	$125,951	$5.00		1	$460,412
20	PINNACLES NM	W	191,578	59,868	$1.00	$21,636	$5.00		1	$119,736
21	SEQUOIA/KINGS CANYON NP	W	1,813,924	566,851	$2.00	$328,121	$5.00		1	$656,242
22	SHENANDOAH NP	MA	1,933,085	604,089	$2.00	$645,528	$5.00		1	$1,208,178
23	THEODORE ROOSEVELT NP *	RM	377,152	117,860	$1.00	$18,540	$5.00		1	$135,720
24	ZION NP	RM	1,503,272	469,773	$2.00	$245,022	$5.00		1	$939,545
			------------			-----------				------------
			24,193,625			2,046,586				9,876,812
			22.4%			28.8%				19.1%
1	AGATE FOSSIL BEDS NM	MW	10,366	3,239	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$3,887
2	ALLEGHENY PORTAGE RAILROAD NHS	MA	69,523	21,726	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$26,071
3	ANDERSONVILLE NHS	SE	118,440	37,013	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$44,415
4	AZTEC RUINS NM	SW	58,187	18,183	$1.00	$12,702	$3.00		1	$21,820
5	BADLANDS NP	RM	950,242	296,951	$1.00	$94,198	$3.00		1	$356,341
6	BLACK CANYON OF THE GUNNISON NM	RM	266,012	83,129	$1.00	$26,698	$3.00		1	$99,755
7	CABRILLO NM	W	1,652,089	516,278	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$619,533
8	CANAVERAL NS	SE	31,769	9,928	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$11,913
9	CANYON DE CHELLY NM	SW	452,286	141,339	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$169,607
10	CAPE HATTERAS NS	SE	1,224,687	382,715	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$459,258
11	CAPITOL REEF NP	RM	320,503	100,157	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$120,189
12	CAPULIN MOUNTAIN NM	SW	43,810	13,691	$1.00	$9,350	$3.00		1	$16,429
13	CASA GRANDE NM	W	142,252	44,454	$1.00	$25,504	$3.00		1	$53,345
14	CEDAR BREAKS NM	RM	385,381	120,432	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$144,518
15	CHIRACAHUA NM	W	61,680	19,275	$1.00	$10,430	$3.00		1	$23,130
16	CORONADO N MEM	W	44,026	13,758	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$16,510
17	COWPENS NB	SE	79,372	24,804	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$29,765
18	CRATERS OF THE MOON NM	PNW	172,503	53,907	$1.00	$10,890	$3.00		1	$64,689
19	CUMBERLAND GAP NHS	SE	729,685	228,027	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$273,632
20	CUSTER BATTLEFIELD NM	RM	261,686	81,777	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$98,132
21	DEVILS POSTPILE NM	W	108,678	33,962	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$40,754
22	DEVILS TOWER NM	RM	216,787	67,746	$1.00	$41,126	$3.00		1	$81,295
23	FLORISSANT FOSSIL BEDS NM	RM	93,990	29,372	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$35,246
24	FORT DAVIS NHS	SW	68,410	21,378	$1.00	$10,793	$3.00		1	$25,654
25	FORT DONELSON NMP	SE	300,404	93,876	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$112,652
26	FORT RALEIGH NHS	SE	272,832	85,260	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$102,312
27	FORT WASHINGTON	NC	367,587	114,871	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$137,845
28	GREAT FALLS PARK (GWMP)	NC	250,000	78,125	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$93,750
29	GREAT SAND DUNES NM	RM	182,713	57,098	$1.00	$39,843	$3.00		1	$68,517
30	GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NP	SW	147,758	46,174	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$55,409
31	GUILFORD COURTHOUSE NMP	SE	179,278	56,024	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$67,229

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PROPOSED ENTRANCE FEE AREAS--BY FEE AMOUNT

PARK	REG	VISITS 85	VEHICLES 85	85 FEE	85 ENT REVENUE	87 FEE	FEE TYPE PERS	VEH	87 REVENUE
32 GULF ISLANDS NS *	SE	9,880,814	3,087,754	$1.00	$93,752	$3.00		1	$225,005
33 HALEAKALA NP	W	1,194,651	373,328	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$447,994
34 HOPEWELL FURNACE NHS	MA	154,027	48,133	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$57,760
35 MONTEZUMA CASTLE NM	W	545,624	170,508	$1.00	$86,644	$3.00		1	$204,609
36 OLYMPIC NP *	PNW	2,532,145	791,295	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$474,777
37 ORGAN PIPE CACTUS NM	W	175,581	54,869	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$65,843
38 PADRE ISLAND NS	SW	669,078	209,087	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$250,904
39 PIPE SPRING NM	RM	30,083	9,401	$0.50	$5,155	$3.00	1		$11,281
40 PIPESTONE NM	MW	131,204	41,001	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$49,202
41 SAGUARO NM	W	636,711	198,972	$0.00		$3.00		1	$238,767
42 SCOTTS BLUFF NM	MW	168,616	52,693	$1.00	$10,933	$3.00		1	$63,231
43 TONTO NM	W	73,606	23,002	$1.00	$6,297	$3.00		1	$27,602
44 TUMACACORI NM	W	58,022	18,132	$1.00	$10,776	$3.00		1	$21,758
45 TUZIGOOT NM	W	90,934	28,417	$1.00	$15,728	$3.00		1	$34,100
46 WALNUT CANYON NM	W	90,077	28,149	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$33,779
47 WHITE SANDS NM	SW	486,754	152,111	$1.00	$78,491	$3.00		1	$182,533
48 WIND CAVE NP	RM	466,585	145,808	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$174,969
49 WUPATKI-SUNSET CRATER NM	W	191,950	59,984	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$71,981
		26,839,398 24.9%			589,310 8.3%				6,109,696 11.8%
1 ADAMS NHS	NA	24,555	N\A	$0.50	$5,237	$2.50	1		$24,555
2 APOSTLE ISLANDS NL	MW	117,353	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$117,353
3 CHACO CULTURE NHP	SW	43,133	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$43,133
4 CUMBERLAND ISLAND NS	SE	30,077	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$18,046
5 EDISON NHS	NA	32,599	N/A	$0.50	$7,144	$2.50	1		$32,599
6 FREDERICK LAW OLMSTEAD NHS	NA	3,457	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$3,457
7 GOLDEN SPIKE NHS	RM	46,387	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$46,387
8 GRANT-KOHRS RANCH NHS	RM	23,166	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$23,166
9 HARPERS FERRY NHP	NC	566,661	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$566,661
10 HOME OF FRANKLIN D ROOSEVELT NHS	NA	214,011	N/A	$1.50	$0	$2.50	1		$128,407
11 INDEPENDENCE NHP *	MA	4,867,399	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$2,433,699
12 JOHN MUIR HOUSE NHS	W	33,954	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$33,954
13 LONGFELLOW NHS	NA	19,186	N/A	$0.50	$6,362	$2.50	1		$19,186
14 LOWELL NHP	NA	706,921	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$706,921
15 LYNDON B JOHNSON NHP	SW	287,622	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$287,622
16 SAINT-GAUDENS NHS	NA	31,880	N/A	$0.50	$4,536	$2.50	1		$31,880
		7,048,361 6.5%			23,279 0.3%				4,517,026 8.7%
1 ANDREW JOHNSON NHS	SE	68,607	N/A	$0.50	$2,318	$1.50	1		$41,164
2 ANTIETAM NB	NC	585,190	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$351,114
3 APPOMATTOX COURTHOUSE NHP	MA	277,613	86,754	$1.00	$25,157	$1.50	1		$52,052
4 ARKANSAS POST NMEM	SW	55,113	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$33,068
5 ARLINGTON HOUSE-ROBT. E. LEE NMEM	NC	496,848	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$298,109
6 BENT'S OLD FORT NHS	RM	42,875	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$25,725
7 BIG HOLE NB	RM	34,603	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$20,762
8 BOOKER T WASHINGTON NM	MA	19,644	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$11,786
9 BOSTON NHP	NA	1,560,527	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$936,316
10 BUCK ISLAND REEF NM	SE	62,345	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$37,407
11 CAPE LOOKOUT NS	SE	100,380	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$60,228
12 CARL SANDBURG HOME NHS	SE	53,689	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$32,213
13 CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NM	SE	1,033,048	N/A	$0.50	$207,109	$1.50	1		$619,829
14 CASTLE CLINTON NM	NA	128,012	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$76,807
15 CHICKAMAUGA/CHATTANOOGA NMP *	SE	1,075,504	N/A	$0.50	$9,269	$1.50	1		$426,302
16 CHRISTIANSTED NHS	SE	133,603	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$80,162
17 CLARA BARTON NHS	NC	17,315	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$10,389
18 DE SOTO N MEM	SE	201,869	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$121,121
19 EDGAR ALLEN POE NHS	MA	15,254	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$9,152
20 EFFIGY MOUNDS NM	MW	93,074	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$55,844
21 EISENHOWER NHS	MA	136,935	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$82,161
22 EL MORRO NM	SW	47,299	N/A	$1.00	$5,574	$1.50	1		$28,379
23 ELEANOR ROOSEVELT NHS	NA	30,712	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$18,427
24 FORD'S THEATRE NHS *	NC	769,780	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$304,833
25 FORT CAROLINE NMEM	SE	164,145	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$98,487
26 FORT CLATSOP NMEM	PNW	159,861	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$95,917
27 FORT FREDERICA NM	SE	231,010	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$138,606
28 FORT LARNED NHS	MW	58,625	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$35,175
29 FORT McHENRY NM & HISTORIC SHRINE	MA	795,752	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$477,451
30 FORT NECESSITY NB	MA	140,199	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$84,119
31 FORT PULASKI NM	SE	381,616	N/A	$1.00	$18,362	$1.50	1		$22,034

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PROPOSED ENTRANCE FEE AREAS--BY FEE AMOUNT

	PARK	REG	VISITS 85	VEHICLES 85	85 FEE	85 ENT REVENUE	87 FEE	FEE TYPE PERS	VEH	87 REVENUE
32	FORT SCOTT NHS	MW	76,193	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$45,716
33	FORT SMITH NHS	SW	138,410	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$83,046
34	FORT STANWIX NM	NA	67,100	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$40,260
35	FORT VANCOUVER NHS	PNW	264,829	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$158,897
36	FREDERICKSBURG/SPOTSYLVANIA NMP	MA	240,932	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$144,559
37	FRIENDSHIP HILL NHS	MA	13,620	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$8,172
38	GEORGE ROGERS CLARK NHP	MW	121,555	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$72,933
39	GEORGE WASHINGTON BIRTHPLACE NM	MA	150,515	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$90,309
40	GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NM	MW	137,117	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$82,270
41	GETTYSBURG NMP	MA	1,321,130	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$792,678
42	GRAND PORTAGE NM	MW	46,488	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$27,893
43	HAMPTON MANSION NHS	MA	69,970	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$41,982
44	HARRY S TRUMAN NHS	MW	114,686	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$68,812
45	HERBERT HOOVER NHS	MW	207,845	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$124,707
46	HOMESTEAD NM OF AMERICA	MW	21,268	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$12,761
47	HORSESHOE BEND NMP	SE	62,549	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$37,529
48	JEFFERSON NAT'L EXPANS.MEM NHS *	MW	2,140,316	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$642,095
49	JOHN DAY FOSSIL BEDS	PNW	101,566	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$60,940
50	JOHN F KENNEDY NHS	NA	17,438	N/A	$0.50	$4,382	$1.50	1		$10,463
51	KENNESAW MOUNTAIN NBP	SE	776,340	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$465,804
52	KINGS MOUNTAIN NMP	SE	212,605	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$127,563
53	LINCOLN BOYHOOD NMEM	MW	219,215	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$131,529
54	LINCOLN HOME NHS	MW	431,347	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$258,808
55	MANASSAS NBP	NC	723,998	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$434,399
56	MARTIN VAN BUREN NHS	NA	5,335	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$5,335
57	MINUTE MAN NHP *	NA	895,775	N/A	$0.75	$2,381	$1.50	1		$268,733
58	MOORES CREEK NB	SE	35,000	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$21,000
59	MORRISTOWN NHP *	NA	620,809	N/A	$0.50	$14,218	$1.50	1		$186,243
60	MOUND CITY GROUP NM	MW	39,632	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$23,779
61	NEZ PERCE NHP	PNW	228,300	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$136,980
62	OCMULGEE NM	SE	198,596	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$119,158
63	PEA RIDGE NMP	SW	118,613	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$71,168
64	PECOS NM	SW	44,616	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$26,770
65	PERRY'S VICTORY & INT'L PEACE MEM	MW	154,893	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$92,936
66	PETERSBURG NB	MA	526,073	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$315,644
67	PICTURED ROCKS NL	MW	397,884	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$238,730
68	PUUHONUA O HONAUNAU NHP	W	394,844	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$236,906
69	RICHMOND NHP	MA	305,667	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$183,400
70	ROGER WILLIAMS NMEM	NA	14,480	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$8,688
71	RUSSELL CAVE NM	SE	21,561	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$12,937
72	SAGAMORE HILL NHS	NA	121,598	N/A	$0.50	$23,419	$1.50	1		$72,959
73	SALEM MARITIME NHS	NA	669,983	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$401,990
74	SALINAS NM	SW	29,643	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$17,786
75	SAN JUAN ISLAND NHP	PNW	104,312	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$62,587
76	SAN JUAN NHS *	SE	2,221,661	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$666,498
77	SARATOGA NHP	NA	116,922	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$70,153
78	SAUGUS IRON WORKS NHS	NA	40,320	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$24,192
79	SHILOH NMP	SE	264,428	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$158,657
80	SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NL	MW	897,512	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$538,507
81	SPRINGFIELD ARMORY NHS	NA	16,123	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$9,674
82	STATUE OF LIBERTY NM	NA	190,172	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$114,103
83	STONES RIVER NB	SE	196,299	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$117,779
84	THEODORE ROOSEVELT BIRTHPLACE NHS	NA	17,511	N/A	$0.50		$1.50	1		$10,507
85	THEODORE ROOSEVELT INAUGURAL NHS	NA	12,416	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$7,450
86	TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE NHS	SE	96,655	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$57,993
87	USS ARIZONA MEMORIAL	W	1,174,573	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$704,744
88	VALLEY FORGE NHP *	MA	4,177,029	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$1,253,109
89	VANDERBILT MANSION NHS	NA	324,128	N/A	$1.50	$99,053	$1.50	1		$99,053
90	VICKSBURG NMP	SE	899,674	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$539,804
91	WASHINGTON MONUMENT	NC	1,229,062	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$737,437
92	WHITMAN MISSION NHS	PNW	104,050	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$62,430
93	WILSON'S CREEK NB	MW	176,821	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$106,093
94	WOMAN'S RIGHTS NHP	NA	14,755	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$8,853
95	WRIGHT BROTHERS N MEM	SE	448,677	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$269,206
			34,194,481 31.7%			411,242 5.8%				16,709,236 32.3%
194	TOTALS		107,939,455	20,924,203		$7,095,800				$51,800,000

United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

July 29, 1986

Honorable Malcolm Wallop
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Lands,
Reserved Water and Resource Conservation
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Wallop:

In response to your letters of June 18, and June 24, enclosed are answers to additional questions for the record of the hearing on S. 2130 and S. 2204, which were submitted by Senator Johnston and Senator Murkowski.

We appreciate this opportunity to supplement our testimony.

Sincerely,

Bill Horn

William P. Horn
Assistant Secretary for Fish and
Wildlife and Parks

Enclosures

QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR JOHNSTON FOR THE ADMINISTRATION REGARDING PARK ENTRANCE FEES

Question 1. Please provide a complete (and up to date) list of the park units where entrance fees would be charged under the Administration's proposal and the fee amount recommended for each. Please note those instances where the fee or park unit is different from that provided the Committee staff at the Department's March 10 briefing. Please explain the reason for any variation between these two lists.

Answer. Attached is the current proposed entrance fee list. Four units were removed from the March 10 list: Fort Point National Historic Site and Muir Woods National Monument are technically within the boundaries of Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and entrance fees to Golden Gate National Recreation Area are prohibited by law; Fort Sumter National Monument was removed because the concessionaire currently collects a transportation fee of $8.00 per person and the fee that the government obtains as a franchise fee from the concessionaire makes up for any lost entrance fee revenue; and Hot Springs National Park was removed from the list because it was not considered feasible to charge an entrance fee due to ongoing construction on both a new National Park Service visitor center and extensive construction on historic structures.

Question 2. Your statement indicates that with the fee increases proposed in S. 2204, fee revenues would represent 11% of the ONPS operating budget. Does the Administration still support the proposition that eventually 25% of park operating budgets should come from fees?

Answer. The Administration would support the eventual rise of recreation fees Government-wide to that level over an appropriate period of time, to recover 25% of the recreation costs only, not all operating costs. We believe that our fees proposal reflects the appropriate contribution of the National Park Service to that effort. The President's Commission on Americans Outdoors is currently studying the issue of financing recreational programs.

Question 3. Would you support an amendment to S. 2204 that references the list of parks and proposed fees so that we know for certain what the fees will be?

Answer. We would not support such an amendment. This will be a new program for 134 parks and as a result we would expect changes in some of the fees with experience. In addition some of the 133 areas which are not now listed should be added for one reason or another not now apparent. It is reasonable to assume that some reasons for not imposing a fee at a particular area at this time may be overcome. We would prefer the flexibility to adjust this program as we currently adjust recreation user fees.

Question 4. How was the figure $40.00 for the Golden Eagle passport determined? Does the National Park Service have any plans to increase its marketing efforts relative to encouraging people to purchase the Golden Eagle?

Answer. Presently the $10.00 Golden Eagle is approximately a 4 to 1 ratio against the maximum $2.00 to $3.00 entrance fee. The $40.00 Golden Eagle reflects that same ratio. It is our belief that as soon as the majority of the National Park System areas begin charging entrance fees, the Golden Eagle will be a greater value and at that time we will increase our education efforts in that regard.

Question 5. Please explain in detail, how the money collected from fees will be used? Will some be returned directly to the collecting park? Would you support an amendment detailing these distribution criteria in the statute?

Answer. Under our proposal, we would retain $59 million or 80% of the total recreation fee revenues. Of that total, $11.1 million or 18.8% will remain at the parks to cover the cost of collection. Servicewide programs, which benefit all units of the system, will receive $33.7 million or 57.1%. The remaining $14.2 million or 24.1% will be divided between both fee and non-fee parks, with fee parks receiving the majority. Attached is a park-by-park breakdown of this $14.2 million. We would prefer the flexibility of language that referred to operations, rather than that which restricted the funds to certain operational elements.

Question 6. Would you support language like that included in the fee amendment offered to the supplemental appropriations bill on June 6, requiring that all fee revenue (except that found to be in "excess" of the parks' needs) be returned to the collecting park?

Answer: We would not support language that requires all fee revenue except that found to be excess be returned to the collecting park. We believe some adjustment needs to be made to recognize the operational needs of parks that do not collect fees for one reason or another.

Question 7. Why does the Administration bill propose not to charge fees at urban recreation areas? If it is because of economic considerations, aren't there likely to be poor people who are affected by high fees at non-urban parks? If the rationale is multiple entrance points, aren't there other kinds of fees that could be charged to raise revenue badly needed by these parks?

Answer. The rationale for not charging entrance fees at urban recreation areas is a combination of economic considerations and multiple entrance points. The purposes for which such urban recreation areas were established include providing recreation opportunities for people without requiring them to travel long distances to visit the areas which we refer to as destination parks. Congress has in most cases made a policy determination in law that entrance fees may not be charged at such areas. The Administration bill does not propose repeal of any park-specific prohibitions on the charging of entrance or admission fees. Of the 10 parks with proposed entrance fees of $10.00 per vehicle, all are what we refer to as destination parks, requiring both time and money to see, and the fee is not normally a factor in determining whether or not to visit. At some of the urban parks the Service already collects user fees such as parking and bath house fees, which under the Administration's proposal would be distributed in part back to the collecting area.

Question 8. What percentage of the visitation at the major national parks in the West is local or regional as opposed to long distance?

Answer. The National Park Service does not keep detailed data on the place of residence of visitors. However, field personnel advise that the source of visitors varies from area to area. For example, visitation to Yosemite National Park is heavily from California, but visitation to Grand Canyon National Park is national and international.

Question 9. How do you intend to insure that higher fees are not used to offset cuts in appropriated dollars? Please be specific as to the steps you plan to take in this regard.

Answer. Our proposal would require that 20% of all fees be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. This would constitute our contribution to defict reduction, and we would expect that the Office of Management and Budget and the Appropriations Committees of Congress will take our contribution into consideration when they establish our operating budgets. Specifically, we will vigorously appeal any proposed offset cuts by the Office of Management and Budget or the Appropriations Committees. We intend that the operational base of $596 million will be maintained through the budget cycles in future years. This is the long range projections shown in the Office of Management and Budget planning allowances for fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990.

Question 10. What does the National Park Service currently charge for the transportation system in Denali National Park? What will the new charge be now that you are recommending that the freeze on that fee be removed?

Answer. Currently there is no charge to the visitor for using the bus system at Denali National Park because of the prohibition in law. If the prohibition were repealed as we recommend we would propose bus fees of $5.00 a day, $10.00 for three days or $20.00 for the season. We do not expect, however, that these fees would cover the entire cost of the transportation system.

Question 11. Would you support the inclusion of a sunset provision in this legislation so that the Congress and the public would have a chance to review the terms and conditions of the "contract" you say this legislation represents?

Answer. Yes. We believe, however, that the period in which the program is permitted to operate should be long enough to permit corrections and adjustments that may be necessary. We believe 10 years to be appropriate, and four years to be a minimum.

Question 12. I am informed that the transportation concessionaire at Cumberland Island National Seashore currently charges park visitors about $8.00 for a round trip passage to the seashore, yet, the National Park Service would charge an additional $5.00 per vehicle. In calculating the fee for this area, did you take these transportation charges into account?

Answer. The entrance fee at Cumberland Island National Seashore would be $2.50 per person, excluding children under 16 and holders of the Golden Age and Golden Access passports. The concessionaire transportation fee was a consideration in the fee setting; however, this is a case that supports the need for flexibility in being able to adjust fees so as to assure that visitation is not adversely affected. Please refer to the most recent fee schedule attached which indicates that the fee for Cumberland Island would be $2.50 per person and not $5.00 per car as originally proposed.

Question 13. On page NPS-162 of the park service's budget justification, a list of programs is displayed with amounts included for base program level, enhanced program level, and total program level. The accompanying text reads, in part;

> The amounts listed in the column headed "base program level" are activities financed in prior years from appropriated funds, but which are considered appropriate for funding from fee revenues for several reasons.

Thus it appears that fee revenues are being used to offset cuts in these programs rather than to supplement or enhance them. Is this consistent with your testimony that fee revenues would not be used for such purposes?

Answer. Of the amount returned to the National Park Service out of entrance and user fees, $15.2 million will be supplemental to enhance operational programs. Unless otherwise directed, we would intend to use the remainder to restore the automatic Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reductions which we absorbed in fiscal year 1986 and to cover increases in fixed costs for ongoing activities.

QUESTIONS FOR THE ADMINISTRATION
FROM SENATOR FRANK MURKOWSKI

Question 1. It is my understanding that S. 2204 and S. 2130 would not supercede section 203 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act which states that "no fees shall be charged for entrance or admission to any unit of the National Park System located in Alaska." Is my understanding correct? Would an amendment to the legislation such as the one below be necessary to clarify this interpretation?

Amendment: Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 203 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act shall remain in effect.

Answer. Your understanding is correct, and no amendment to either bill would be necessary.

Question 2. Which parks not established by ANILCA would be authorized to charge recreational fees? How much would these fees be?

Answer. We assume your question refers to which parks in Alaska not established by ANILCA would be authorized by S. 2204 to charge entrance or admission fees. The answer is none. None of the 23 units of the National Park System in Alaska may charge entrance or admission fees.

Question 3. S. 2204, the Administration's bill, authorizes the repeal of the prohibition on the Secretary for charging a fee for bus access to Denali National Park. Do all parks in the U.S. providing bus access charge for transportation? How many parks do not charge for bus transportation?

Answer. The number of parks providing bus transportation, including buses operated as concessions and those operated through National Park Service procurement contracts, is 12; of this number 2 parks charge for the bus transportation service and 10 parks, including Denali, do not charge.

Question 4. What is the estimated cost of collecting the fees? How much revenue is expected to be generated through the fees?

Answer. The estimated cost of collecting the fee for bus transportation in Denali is $40,000 per year, following a one-time nonrecurring startup cost of $133,000 the first year. We estimate that gross receipts totalling $513,650 would be generated each year through the charging of fees for the bus service at Denali.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PROPOSED ENTRANCE FEE AREAS--BY FEE AMOUNT

	PARK	REG	VISITS 85	VEHICLES 85	85 FEE	85 ENT REVENUE	87 FEE	FEE TYPE		87 REVENUE
								PERS	VEH	
1	BIG BEND NP	SW	188,045	58,764	$0.00	$0	$10.00		1	$235,056
2	EVERGLADES NP	SE	697,646	218,014	$2.00	$162,223	$10.00		1	$872,058
3	GLACIER NP	RM	1,603,011	500,941	$2.00	$195,731	$10.00		1	$782,924
4	GRAND CANYON NP	W	2,711,529	847,353	$2.00	$896,652	$10.00		1	$3,389,411
5	GRAND TETON NP	RM	1,334,483	417,026	$2.00	$265,739	$10.00		1	$1,062,956
6	MESA VERDE NP	RM	656,271	205,085	$2.00	$184,086	$10.00		1	$820,339
7	MOUNT RANIER NP	PNW	1,165,640	364,263	$2.00	$257,231	$10.00		1	$1,457,050
8	ROCKY MOUNTAIN NP	RM	2,248,854	702,767	$2.00	$119,747	$10.00		1	$478,988
9	YELLOWSTONE NP	RM	2,226,159	695,675	$2.00	$487,127	$10.00		1	$1,948,508
10	YOSEMITE NP	WR	2,831,952	884,985	$3.00	$1,456,847	$10.00		1	$3,539,940
			15,663,590 14.5%			4,025,383 56.7%				14,587,230 28.2%
1	ACADIA NP *	NA	3,745,570	1,170,491	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$2,060,157
2	ASSATEAGUE ISLAND NS *	MA	2,304,906	720,283	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$440,566
3	BANDELIER NM	SW	238,434	74,511	$1.00	$28,571	$5.00		1	$149,021
4	BRYCE CANYON NP	RM	500,782	156,494	$2.00	$135,783	$5.00		1	$312,989
5	CANYONLANDS NP	RM	541,315	169,161	$1.00	$42,390	$5.00		1	$338,322
6	CAPE COD NS *	NA	4,374,799	1,367,125	$1.00	$135,377	$5.00		1	$541,508
7	COLONIAL NHP *	MA	2,138,188	668,184	$2.00	$110,063	$5.00		1	$220,125
8	COLORADO NM *	RM	319,248	99,765	$1.00	$17,856	$5.00		1	$99,530
9	CRATER LAKE NP	PNW	390,604	122,064	$2.00	$112,817	$5.00		1	$244,128
10	DEATH VALLEY NM	W	576,679	180,212	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$360,424
11	DINOSAUR NM	RM	418,187	130,683	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$261,367
12	FORT LARAMIE NHS	RM	81,531	25,478	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$50,957
13	FORT UNION NM	SW	13,362	4,176	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$8,351
14	HAWAII VOLCANOES NP	W	816,652	255,204	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$510,408
15	ISLE ROYALE NP	MW	16,775	N/A	$0.00	$0	$5.00	1		$33,550
16	JOSHUA TREE NM	W	641,172	200,366	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$400,733
17	LASSEN VOLCANIC NP	W	451,497	141,093	$1.00	$78,931	$5.00		1	$282,186
18	LAVA BEDS NM	W	68,254	21,329	$0.00	$0	$5.00		1	$42,659
19	PETRIFIED FOREST NP	W	736,659	230,206	$1.00	$125,951	$5.00		1	$460,412
20	PINNACLES NM	W	191,578	59,868	$1.00	$21,636	$5.00		1	$119,736
21	SEQUOIA/KINGS CANYON NP	W	1,813,924	566,851	$2.00	$328,121	$5.00		1	$656,242
22	SHENANDOAH NP	MA	1,933,085	604,089	$2.00	$645,528	$5.00		1	$1,208,178
23	THEODORE ROOSEVELT NP *	RM	377,152	117,860	$1.00	$18,540	$5.00		1	$135,720
24	ZION NP	RM	1,503,272	469,773	$2.00	$245,022	$5.00		1	$939,545
			24,193,625 22.4%			2,046,586 28.8%				9,876,812 19.1%
1	AGATE FOSSIL BEDS NM	MW	10,366	3,239	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$3,887
2	ALLEGHENY PORTAGE RAILROAD NHS	MA	69,523	21,726	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$26,071
3	ANDERSONVILLE NHS	SE	118,440	37,013	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$44,415
4	AZTEC RUINS NM	SW	58,187	18,183	$1.00	$12,702	$3.00		1	$21,820
5	BADLANDS NP	RM	950,242	296,951	$1.00	$94,198	$3.00		1	$356,341
6	BLACK CANYON OF THE GUNNISON NM	RM	266,012	83,129	$1.00	$26,698	$3.00		1	$99,755
7	CABRILLO NM	W	1,652,089	516,278	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$619,533
8	CANAVERAL NS	SE	31,769	9,928	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$11,913
9	CANYON DE CHELLY NM	SW	452,286	141,339	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$169,607
10	CAPE HATTERAS NS	SE	1,224,687	382,715	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$459,258
11	CAPITOL REEF NP	RM	320,503	100,157	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$120,189
12	CAPULIN MOUNTAIN NM	SW	43,810	13,691	$1.00	$9,350	$3.00		1	$16,429
13	CASA GRANDE NM	W	142,252	44,454	$1.00	$25,504	$3.00		1	$53,345
14	CEDAR BREAKS NM	RM	385,381	120,432	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$144,518
15	CHIRACAHUA NM	W	61,680	19,275	$1.00	$10,430	$3.00		1	$23,130
16	CORONADO N MEM	W	44,026	13,758	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$16,510
17	COWPENS NB	SE	79,372	24,804	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$29,765
18	CRATERS OF THE MOON NM	PNW	172,503	53,907	$1.00	$10,890	$3.00		1	$64,689
19	CUMBERLAND GAP NHS	SE	729,685	228,027	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$273,632
20	CUSTER BATTLEFIELD NM	RM	261,686	81,777	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$98,132
21	DEVILS POSTPILE NM	W	108,678	33,962	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$40,754
22	DEVILS TOWER NM	RM	216,787	67,746	$1.00	$41,126	$3.00		1	$81,295
23	FLORISSANT FOSSIL BEDS NM	RM	93,990	29,372	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$35,246
24	FORT DAVIS NHS	SW	68,410	21,378	$1.00	$10,793	$3.00		1	$25,654
25	FORT DONELSON NMP	SE	300,404	93,876	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$112,652
26	FORT RALEIGH NHS	SE	272,832	85,260	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$102,312
27	FORT WASHINGTON	NC	367,587	114,871	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$137,845
28	GREAT FALLS PARK (GWMP)	NC	250,000	78,125	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$93,750
29	GREAT SAND DUNES NM	RM	182,713	57,098	$1.00	$39,843	$3.00		1	$68,517
30	GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NP	SW	147,758	46,174	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$55,409
31	GUILFORD COURTHOUSE NMP	SE	179,278	56,024	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$67,229

330:05-Jun-86

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PROPOSED ENTRANCE FEE AREAS--BY FEE AMOUNT

PARK	REG	VISITS 85	VEHICLES 85	85 FEE	85 ENT REVENUE	87 FEE	FEE TYPE PERS	FEE TYPE VEH	87 REVENUE
32 GULF ISLANDS NS *	SE	9,880,814	3,087,754	$1.00	$93,752	$3.00		1	$225,005
33 HALEAKALA NP	W	1,194,651	373,328	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$447,994
34 HOPEWELL FURNACE NHS	MA	154,027	48,133	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$57,760
35 MONTEZUMA CASTLE NM	W	545,624	170,508	$1.00	$86,644	$3.00		1	$204,609
36 OLYMPIC NP *	PNW	2,532,145	791,295	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$474,777
37 ORGAN PIPE CACTUS NM	W	175,581	54,869	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$65,843
38 PADRE ISLAND NS	SW	669,078	209,087	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$250,904
39 PIPE SPRING NM	RM	30,083	9,401	$0.50	$5,155	$3.00	1		$11,281
40 PIPESTONE NM	MW	131,204	41,001	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$49,202
41 SAGUARO NM	W	636,711	198,972	$0.00		$3.00		1	$238,767
42 SCOTTS BLUFF NM	MW	168,616	52,693	$1.00	$10,933	$3.00		1	$63,231
43 TONTO NM	W	73,606	23,002	$1.00	$6,297	$3.00		1	$27,602
44 TUMACACORI NM	W	58,022	18,132	$1.00	$10,776	$3.00		1	$21,758
45 TUZIGOOT NM	W	90,934	28,417	$1.00	$15,728	$3.00		1	$34,100
46 WALNUT CANYON NM	W	90,077	28,149	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$33,779
47 WHITE SANDS NM	SW	486,754	152,111	$1.00	$78,491	$3.00		1	$182,533
48 WIND CAVE NP	RM	466,585	145,808	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$174,969
49 WUPATKI-SUNSET CRATER NM	W	191,950	59,984	$0.00	$0	$3.00		1	$71,981
		------------			------------				------------
		26,839,398 24.9%			589,310 8.3%				6,109,696 11.8%
1 ADAMS NHS	MA	24,555	N\A	$0.50	$5,237	$2.50	1		$24,555
2 APOSTLE ISLANDS NL	MW	117,353	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$117,353
3 CHACO CULTURE NHP	SW	43,133	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$43,133
4 CUMBERLAND ISLAND NS	SE	30,077	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$18,046
5 EDISON NHS	MA	32,599	N/A	$0.50	$7,144	$2.50	1		$32,599
6 FREDERICK LAW OLMSTEAD NHS	MA	3,457	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$3,457
7 GOLDEN SPIKE NHS	RM	46,387	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$46,387
8 GRANT-KOHRS RANCH NHS	RM	23,166	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$23,166
9 HARPERS FERRY NHP	NC	566,661	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$566,661
10 HOME OF FRANKLIN D ROOSEVELT NHS	MA	214,011	N/A	$1.50	$0	$2.50	1		$128,407
11 INDEPENDENCE NHP *	MA	4,867,399	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$2,433,699
12 JOHN MUIR HOUSE NHS	W	33,954	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$33,954
13 LONGFELLOW NHS	MA	19,186	N/A	$0.50	$6,362	$2.50	1		$19,186
14 LOWELL NHP	MA	706,921	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$706,921
15 LYNDON B JOHNSON NHP	SW	287,622	N/A	$0.00	$0	$2.50	1		$287,622
16 SAINT-GAUDENS NHS	MA	31,880	N/A	$0.50	$4,536	$2.50	1		$31,880
		------------			------------				------------
		7,048,361 6.5%			23,279 0.3%				4,517,026 8.7%
1 ANDREW JOHNSON NHS	SE	68,607	N/A	$0.50	$2,318	$1.50	1		$41,164
2 ANTIETAM NB	NC	585,190	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$351,114
3 APPOMATTOX COURTHOUSE NHP	MA	277,613	86,754	$1.00	$25,157	$1.50	1		$52,052
4 ARKANSAS POST NMEM	SW	55,113	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$33,068
5 ARLINGTON HOUSE-ROBT. E. LEE NMEM	NC	496,848	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$298,109
6 BENT'S OLD FORT NHS	RM	42,875	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$25,725
7 BIG HOLE NB	RM	34,603	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$20,762
8 BOOKER T WASHINGTON NM	MA	19,644	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$11,786
9 BOSTON NHP	NA	1,560,527	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$936,316
10 BUCK ISLAND REEF NM	SE	62,345	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$37,407
11 CAPE LOOKOUT NS	SE	100,380	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$60,228
12 CARL SANDBURG HOME NHS	SE	53,689	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$32,213
13 CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NM	SE	1,033,048	N/A	$0.50	$207,109	$1.50	1		$619,829
14 CASTLE CLINTON NM	NA	128,012	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$76,807
15 CHICKAMAUGA/CHATTANOOGA NMP *	SE	1,075,504	N/A	$0.50	$9,269	$1.50	1		$426,302
16 CHRISTIANSTED NHS	SE	133,603	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$80,162
17 CLARA BARTON NHS	NC	17,315	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$10,389
18 DE SOTO N MEM	SE	201,869	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$121,121
19 EDGAR ALLEN POE NHS	MA	15,254	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$9,152
20 EFFIGY MOUNDS NM	MW	93,074	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$55,844
21 EISENHOWER NHS	MA	136,935	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$82,161
22 EL MORRO NM	SW	47,299	N/A	$1.00	$5,574	$1.50	1		$28,379
23 ELEANOR ROOSEVELT NHS	NA	30,712	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$18,427
24 FORD'S THEATRE NHS *	NC	769,780	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$304,833
25 FORT CAROLINE NMEM	SE	164,145	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$98,487
26 FORT CLATSOP NMEM	PNW	159,861	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$95,917
27 FORT FREDERICA NM	SE	231,010	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$138,606
28 FORT LARNED NHS	MW	58,625	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$35,175
29 FORT McHENRY NM & HISTORIC SHRINE	MA	795,752	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$477,451
30 FORT NECESSITY NB	MA	140,199	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$84,119
31 FORT PULASKI NM	SE	381,616	N/A	$1.00	$18,362	$1.50	1		$22,034

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE PROPOSED ENTRANCE FEE AREAS--BY FEE AMOUNT

PARK	REG	VISITS 85	VEHICLES 85	85 FEE	85 ENT REVENUE	87 FEE	FEE TYPE PERS	FEE TYPE VEH	87 REVENUE
32 FORT SCOTT NHS	MW	76,193	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$45,716
33 FORT SMITH NHS	SW	138,410	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$83,046
34 FORT STANWIX NM	NA	67,100	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$40,260
35 FORT VANCOUVER NHS	PNW	264,829	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$158,897
36 FREDERICKSBURG/SPOTSYLVANIA NMP	MA	240,932	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$144,559
37 FRIENDSHIP HILL NHS	MA	13,620	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$8,172
38 GEORGE ROGERS CLARK NHP	MW	121,555	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$72,933
39 GEORGE WASHINGTON BIRTHPLACE NM	MA	150,515	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$90,309
40 GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER NM	MW	137,117	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$82,270
41 GETTYSBURG NMP	MA	1,321,130	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$792,678
42 GRAND PORTAGE NM	MW	46,488	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$27,893
43 HAMPTON MANSION NHS	MA	69,970	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$41,982
44 HARRY S TRUMAN NHS	MW	114,686	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$68,812
45 HERBERT HOOVER NHS	MW	207,845	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$124,707
46 HOMESTEAD NM OF AMERICA	MW	21,268	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$12,761
47 HORSESHOE BEND NMP	SE	62,549	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$37,529
48 JEFFERSON NAT'L EXPANS.MEM NHS *	MW	2,140,316	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$642,095
49 JOHN DAY FOSSIL BEDS	PNW	101,566	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$60,940
50 JOHN F KENNEDY NHS	NA	17,438	N/A	$0.50	$4,382	$1.50	1		$10,463
51 KENNESAW MOUNTAIN NBP	SE	776,340	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$465,804
52 KINGS MOUNTAIN NMP	SE	212,605	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$127,563
53 LINCOLN BOYHOOD NMEM	MW	219,215	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$131,529
54 LINCOLN HOME NHS	MW	431,347	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$258,808
55 MANASSAS NBP	NC	723,998	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$434,399
56 MARTIN VAN BUREN NHS	NA	5,335	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$5,335
57 MINUTE MAN NHP *	NA	895,775	N/A	$0.75	$2,381	$1.50	1		$268,733
58 MOORES CREEK NB	SE	35,000	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$21,000
59 MORRISTOWN NHP *	MA	620,809	N/A	$0.50	$14,218	$1.50	1		$186,243
60 MOUND CITY GROUP NM	MW	39,632	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$23,779
61 NEZ PERCE NHP	PNW	228,300	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$136,980
62 OCMULGEE NM	SE	198,596	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$119,158
63 PEA RIDGE NMP	SW	118,613	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$71,168
64 PECOS NM	SW	44,616	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$26,770
65 PERRY'S VICTORY & INT'L PEACE MEM	MW	154,893	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$92,936
66 PETERSBURG NB	MA	526,073	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$315,644
67 PICTURED ROCKS NL	MW	397,884	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$238,730
68 PUUHONUA O HONAUNAU NHP	W	394,844	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$236,906
69 RICHMOND NBP	MA	305,667	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$183,400
70 ROGER WILLIAMS NMEM	NA	14,480	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$8,688
71 RUSSELL CAVE NM	SE	21,561	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$12,937
72 SAGAMORE HILL NHS	NA	121,598	N/A	$0.50	$23,419	$1.50	1		$72,959
73 SALEM MARITIME NHS	NA	669,983	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$401,990
74 SALINAS NM	SW	29,643	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$17,786
75 SAN JUAN ISLAND NHP	PNW	104,312	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$62,587
76 SAN JUAN NHS *	SE	2,221,661	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$666,498
77 SARATOGA NHP	NA	116,922	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$70,153
78 SAUGUS IRON WORKS NHS	NA	40,320	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$24,192
79 SHILOH NMP	SE	264,428	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$158,657
80 SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NL	MW	897,512	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$538,507
81 SPRINGFIELD ARMORY NHS	NA	16,123	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$9,674
82 STATUE OF LIBERTY NM	NA	190,172	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$114,103
83 STONES RIVER NB	SE	196,299	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$117,779
84 THEODORE ROOSEVELT BIRTHPLACE NHS	NA	17,511	N/A	$0.50		$1.50	1		$10,507
85 THEODORE ROOSEVELT INAUGURAL NHS	NA	12,416	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$7,450
86 TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE NHS	SE	96,655	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$57,993
87 USS ARIZONA MEMORIAL	W	1,174,573	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$704,744
88 VALLEY FORGE NHP *	MA	4,177,029	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$1,253,109
89 VANDERBILT MANSION NHS	NA	324,128	N/A	$1.50	$99,053	$1.50	1		$99,053
90 VICKSBURG NMP	SE	899,674	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$539,804
91 WASHINGTON MONUMENT	NC	1,229,062	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$737,437
92 WHITMAN MISSION NHS	PNW	104,050	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$62,430
93 WILSON'S CREEK NB	MW	176,821	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$106,093
94 WOMAN'S RIGHTS NHP	NA	14,755	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$8,853
95 WRIGHT BROTHERS N MEM	SE	448,677	N/A	$0.00	$0	$1.50	1		$269,206
		34,194,481 31.7%			411,242 5.8%				16,709,236 32.3%
194 TOTALS		107,939,455	20,924,203		$7,095,800				$51,800,000

NPS AREAS EXCLUDED FROM ENTRANCE FEE LIST--BY REASON

EXEMPT BY LAW - 42 PARKS

1 ABRAHAM LINCOLN BIRTHPLACE NHS
2 ALL ALASKA AREAS (23 PARKS)
25 AMERICAN MEMORIAL PARK
26 BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY
27 BISCAYNE NATIONAL PARK
28 BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY
29 BOSTON AFRICAN AMERICAN NHS
30 CHANNEL ISLANDS NP
31 FT. JEFFERSON NM
32 FORT POINT NHP
33 GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PKWAY
34 GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NP
35 JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER PARKWAY
36 MARTIN LUTHER KING NHS
37 MOUNT RUSHMORE NMEM
38 MUIR WOODS NM
39 NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY
40 POINT REYES NS
41 VIRGIN ISLANDS NATIONAL PARK
42 WAR IN THE PACIFIC NHP

UNCONTOLLABLE OR MULTIPLE ACCESS - 8 AREAS

1 C & O CANAL NHP
2 FIRE ISLAND NS
3 GENERAL GRANT NMEM
4 LBJ MEMORIAL GROVE OTF NMEM
5 NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS
6 REDWOOD NP
7 ROCK CREEK PARK
8 THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL

AREAS ESTABLISHED FOR URBAN RECREATION - 10 AREAS

1 CHAMIZAL NMEM
2 CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER NRA
3 CHICKASAW NRA
4 CUYAHOGA VALLEY NRA
5 GATEWAY NRA
6 GOLDEN GATE NRA
7 GREENBELT PARK
8 INDIANA DUNES NL
9 PRINCE WILLIAM FOREST PARK
10 SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS NRA

MORE APPROPRIATE FOR USER FEE - 28 AREAS

1 AMISTAD NRA
2 BIG SOUTH FORK N RIVER
3 BIGHORN CANYON NRA
4 BUFFALO NR
5 CARLSBAD CAVERNS NP
6 CONGAREE SWAMP NM
7 COULEE DAM NRA
8 CURECANTI NRA
9 DELAWARE WATER GAP NRA
10 GLEN CANYON NRA
11 JEAN LAFITTE NHP & PRES.
12 JEWEL CAVE NM
13 LAKE MEAD NRA
14 LAKE MEREDITH NRA
15 LEHMAN CAVES NM
16 MAMMOTH CAVE NP
17 NEW RIVER GORGE NR
18 NORTH CASCADES NP
19 OBED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER
20 OREGON CAVES NM
21 OZARK NR
22 RIO GRANDE NR
23 SAINT CROIX NR
24 SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NHP
25 TIMPANAGOS CAVE NM
26 UPPER DELAWARE RIVER

650:6/5/86

NPS AREAS EXCLUDED FROM ENTRANCE FEE LIST--BY REASON

27 VOYAGEURS NP
28 WHISKEYTOWN NRA

LOW VISITATION-LITTLE OR NO DEVELOPMENT - 18 AREAS

1 ALIBATES FLINT QUARRY NM
2 BIG CYPRESS NPRES
3 BIG THICKET NPRES
4 BRICES CROSSROADS NB
5 EUGENE O'NEIL NHS
6 FORT UNION TRADING POST NHS
7 FOSSIL BUTTE NM
8 HOVENWEEP NM
9 KLONDIKE GOLD RUSH (WASHINGTON)
10 KNIVE RIVER INDIAN VILLAGE NHS
11 MAGGIE L. WALKER NHS
12 MONOCACY NB
13 NINETY-SIX NHS
14 RAINBOW BRIDGE NM
15 SAINT CROIS ISLAND NM
16 TUPELO NB
17 WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT NHS
18 YUCCA HOUSE NHS

OTHER (COMPARABILITY, SPECIAL USE, ETC.) - 25 PARKS

1 CATOCTIN MOUNTAIN PARK
2 ELLIS ISLAND NM
3 FEDERAL HALL NMEM
4 FORT SUMTER NM
5 FREDERICK DOUGLASS HOME NHS
6 GILA CLIFF DWELLINGS NM
7 GLORIA DEI CHURCH NHS
8 HAMILTON GRANGE NMEM
9 HISTORIC CAMDEN
10 HOHOKAM-PIMA NM
11 HOT SPRINGS NP
12 HUBBELL TRADING POST NHS
13 JFK CENTER OF THE PERF. ARTS
14 JOHNSTOWN FLOOD NMEM
15 KALAUPAPA NHS
16 KALOKO-HONOKOHAU NHP
17 NAVAJO NM
18 OREGON NHT
19 PALO ALTO BATTLEFIELD
20 PISCATAWAY PARK
21 PU'UKOHOLA HEIAU NHS
22 THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO NMEM
23 THEODORE ROOSEVELT ISLAND NMEM
24 THOMAS STONE NHS
25 VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL NMEM
26 WHITE HOUSE AND PRESIDENT'S PARK
27 WOLF TRAP FARM PARK

TOTAL EXCLUDED 133 AREAS

APPENDIX II

Additional Material Submitted for the Record

STATEMENT

SENATOR GEORGE J. MITCHELL

HEARING ON PARK USER FEES

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY

June 12, 1986

Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to comment on legislation to permit the use of park entrance, admission, and recreation fees for the operation of the National Park System. This measure authorizes a $5.00 entrance fee for Acadia National Park in Maine. Such a fee could seriously disrupt the lives of local residents.

Through your considerable efforts to authorize boundaries for Acadia Park you are aware of the interrelated nature of the park and local communities. Indeed, much of the charm of Acadia derives from its coexistence with fishing villages and towns which have existed since the beginnings of European settlement on the North American continent. A visit to the park is a great experience, made even more so by the ability to visit the several towns in which the Park is located.

This close proximity makes it unlikely that a park entrance fee can be imposed in a way which is equitible to local communities. The park is interlaced with state and local roads. In many cases, access to homes and businesses requires traveling through the park. I emphasize the near impossibility of selecting an appropriate site for the collection of an entrance fee at Acadia without imposing an unfair burden on people going about their daily lives.

Acadia receives over 4 million visitors annually and a $5.00 entrance fee for the park would raise considerable revenues. However, I can't help but think that such a fee would have been established long ago if the questions raised by such a proposal could be adequately addressed. Would, for example, local residents be required to pay the fee? Would they have an annual pass? Would they be required to purchase such a pass? How would businesses serving local residents be accomodated? These are among the questions which must be answered prior to requiring an Acadia entrance fee.

You have been very helpful in developing a balanced approach to the management of Acadia and I very much appreciate your efforts. I look forward to working with you to address this new Acadia park issue.

National Trust for Historic Preservation

1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 (202) 673-4000

June 30, 1986

The Honorable Malcolm Wallop, Chairman
Subcommittee on Public Lands, Reserved
 Water and Resource Conservation
Committee on Energy and Natural
 Resources
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Wallop:

Enclosed you will find my statement concerning S. 2130, the National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986. I hope that you can enter it into the record of your committee hearing of June 12, 1986.

The National Trust is pleased to support this legislation as the most cost-effective and sensitive response to the growing crisis facing the national park system. Furthermore, it is appropriate that this bill should be introduced at this time and coincide with the 20th anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and the 70th anniversary of the National Park Service.

Sincerely,

David A. Doheny

David A. Doheny
Vice President & General Counsel

National Trust for Historic Preservation

1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 (202) 673-4000

STATEMENT OF DAVID A. DOHENY,
VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL,
THE NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION

SUBMITTED TO THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS,
RESERVED WATER AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

JUNE 25, 1986

The National Trust for Historic Preservation strongly supports S. 2130, the National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986. Its adoption would institutionalize cultural and natural resource management and protection as higher priorities within the National Parks Service (NPS) at a critical time in these resources' existence. Current data tell us that the nation still has a choice, although a fast evaporating one: we can adopt S. 2130 and take a significant step now to reverse otherwise unforgiving trends of national park system degradation and resource loss, or we can remain inert merely tending the disappearing remnants of our national heritage. The National Trust supports S. 2130 as a most effective and cost-sensitive response to the resource crisis facing our national park system.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a private, non-profit organization chartered by the U.S. Congress in 1949 to promote the preservation ethic in the public and private sectors and to hold property embodying the nation's heritage. Everyday, our 175,000 members, seven regional offices, and 17 historic house museum properties demonstrate to us the impact of cultural resources on Americans throughout the land. We are pleased to use our historic preservation expertise in examining the proposed legislation.

Americans crave knowledge about their past and the evolution of this hugely varied country. Nowhere is this thirst more effectively satisfied than in visits to America's national parks, 60% of which are classified as primarily historic. The national park system, representing as it does much of the best of the country's cultural and natural resources, allows the achievement of goals shared by many Americans: exploration and appreciation of America's cultural and natural roots. A recent poll conducted by the Gallup organization for the Urban Land Institute indicates just how sensitive to the past Americans have become. Gallup

STATEMENT OF DAVID A. DOHENY

reports a growing interest in permanence, aesthetics, and preserving the past. Ironically, this increased consciousness and appreciation of the nation's roots has prompted more visitation and more stresses on national park resources. We in the preservation world are acutely aware of the inability of NPS to maintain the cultural resources within its guardianship in the face of visitation, pollution, development pressures, and stresses not addressed by S. 2130 such as external development threats on the parks' periphery. Our cultural resources need help, and even S. 2130's important initiatives would not alleviate all of the pressures now threatening them.

We support S. 2130 because it does far more than merely express heart-warming goals. S. 2130 is impressive for the mechanism it would create allowing the identification, monitoring, and achievement of specific management and protection goals. We believe that the strength of S. 2130 lies in its specificity of direction. Without preventing flexibility in application, S. 2130 provides a sensible framework for efficient NPS action and allows immediate response to critical problems already identified by NPS itself. In requiring training of park personnel and on-going analysis of results and remaining needs, S. 2130 would create a self-perpetuating mechanism of caring for the parks' resources, rather than a onetime fix-it exercise which addresses only the symptoms and not the core problems. The National Trust's own experience demonstrates that merely cosmetic efforts will not save a resource or revive an economically depressed neighborhood. For example, our extremely successful Main Street program teaches cities across the country that more is needed than a fresh coat of paint. Paint is important, but it must be accompanied by responses to the specific causes of the downtown area's economic and physical deterioration. S. 2130 would establish preventive maintenance designed to address the fundamental causes of the national park system's deterioration. S. 2130 is impressive, too, in anticipating future needs. Its $2 million yearly matching grant program to foster innovative partnerships between NPS and nonprofit organizations, universities and colleges, and state and local agencies builds on potential already found to be successful in such cooperative efforts as restoration of the Statue of Liberty.

Finally, we support S. 2130's proposed entrance fee increases, recognizing--as we believe most Americans do these days--that certain of life's enjoyments are worth paying for to support. The entrance fee increases must be used exclusively to assist S. 2130's initiatives, however, and not to replace other funding. It would be a national disgrace were public access to the national parks to be used to generate money for programs already funded within NPS or elsewhere. One hundred percent of increased revenues must be used for park resources themselves. On this basis, and with educational group exemptions and fee-free days,

STATEMENT OF DAVID A. DOHENY

the American public would continue to support the national park system gladly.

In the twenty years since enactment of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Americans have learned that the essential response to their love of the past is historic preservation. It is a national ethic fostered by the NHPA's preservation partnership between the private sector and federal, state, and local governments. One reflection of this partnership has been the more than fifteen thousand historic properties rehabilitated by the private sector as a result of the 25% federal rehabilitation tax credit. The credit is available, however, for only commercial and income-producing rental properties. S. 2130 would fill a major gap of the current preservation program by encouraging preservation of cultural resources in public ownership within the national parks system.

S. 2130 is an impressive piece of legislation which thoughtfully addresses a well-documented issue of major concern to the preservation community. The National Trust for Historic Preservation is pleased to offer our support for this banner legislation during the 20th anniversary year of the NHPA and 70th anniversary of NPS. At a time of increasing park visitation and growing American appreciation of historic preservation, we must take action to protect our resources if they are to last for our future enjoyment. The national park system needs S. 2130.

President
Mrs. Judith Colt Johnson
616 Piccadilly Road
Towson, Maryland 21204
301-828-4520

Vice President
Carolyn D. Williams
4202 Forest Court
Fairfax, Virginia 22032
703-273-1961

Committee to Preserve Assateague Island, Inc.

July 23, 1986

STATEMENT ON SENATE BILLS S. 2130 and S. 2204

Re: BILLS THAT WOULD ALLOW ENTRANCE FEES TO BE INCREASED AT MANY NATIONAL PARKS AND TO ESTABLISH FEES FOR THE FIRST TIME AT OTHERS.

TWO BILLS ARE BEFORE CONGRESS

1. Senator Durenberger's bill, S. 2130, which would dedicate all collected fees to a strong 10-year program to protect and enbance the natural and cultural resources in the National Park System. This bill will modestly increase fees to $5.00 in the most heavily visited parks, and increase others to $3.00 and $1.00 (less frequently visited parks that have never had a fee). THIS MAKES SENSE. Any fees should go back to the parks where the fee is collected, to be used in the many ways where they have been cut back, unable to put their master plans in effect, do necessary maintenance and employ the staff necessary to maintain and protect our parks according to the mandates directed by Congress originally.

2. The Administration bill, S. 2204, would raise a total of $74 million, with 20% going to the Treasury and $45 million going to offset budget cuts for five existing park programs. Only $14 million would be left to "enhance" 337 park units throughout the system -- a drop in the bucket considering all the cuts in essential spending for maintenance, personnel, and administrative necessities. Worst of all, S. 2204 requires higher entrance fees but lacks any guidelines directing the Secretary on how the government should spend these funds -- they would go into General Funds. The parks would gain nothing. We oppose this bill.

I have visited National Parks throughout the United States since I was a child. My journeys and in-depth trips have taken me from the parks in the state of Washington (where I was born and where I took my son on trips), dating from 1923 to the present. These include many trips extending from the northwest to Florida, from Maine to California, many, many parks in between, and to Alaska.

3. I would like to say that a fee system is needed for the National Wildlife Refuges, with the monies collected going back to them for management and maintenance needs. The Committee to Preserve Assateague supports S. 2130.

THE COMMITTE'S AND MY OPINION:

The Administration bill, S. 2204, would be a disaster and not help the parks one iota. Why should people pay an entrance fee to go into Govt. general funds?

We support S. 2130, and when I have visited parks over the years there was never anyone who stated objections to a fee system where the money would go back to that park to improve conditions. In this present day of tight money and budget cuts, it is only right that there should be a fee system which would go back to the parks. It should be based on visitation, ranging from $1.00 for the parks with few visitors, to $3.00 with parks with more visitors, to $5.00 for the most frequently visited parks. THIS SHOULD BE WORKED OUT EQUITABLY SO THAT PEOPLE ON BUSES AND VEHICLES ACCOMMODATING LARGE NUMBERS DO NOT GET INTO THE PARKS WITHOUT THEIR PASSENGERS PAYING THEIR FAIR SHARE AS COMPARED TO INDIVIDUAL CARS.

I have visited parks all over the entire country, including Alaska, but let me use Assateague Island as a case study. The island became a National Seashore in 1965, with the law being amended in 1976, and to date it has had no funding to institute its General Management Plan. It has no proper auditorium or offices and has to use a structure built to house maintenance vehicles and do repair work. There are many improvements that need to be made to enhance the experience of visitors.

Our Committee contributes to support two Student Conservation Association volunteers to work at the National Seashore each summer, and we wanted to increase that number to three since budget cuts have decreased the number of full-time and seasonal employees. (Of course, the Student Conservation Assn. volunteers are not a replacement for trained personnel, but they do help.) As the National Park Service has not increased what it gives to the SCA for many years, we could not help support an additional person.

This is the first summer that the Park Service has had to have closures to cars at the Maryland section of the Island. The additional crowds have exceeded the parking spaces available. With staff cuts, it is difficult to cope with such situations.

At the Virginia end of the island, which is the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), with the recreational activities administered by the Park Service, there are many problems due to lack of staff, and maintenance costs are extremely high due to continual severe erosion due to storms, high tides and sea level rise. An intolerable situation exists with their being no other areas at the beach to provide parking for cars, and parking spaces have been lost with the road having been washed out down the "hook" every year since 1970 so that it makes no economic sense to try to rebuild it. Additional personnel are needed to cope with the ever increasing cars and people. The only answer to handling the visitors is to have some sort of public transportation system, such as is so successful at Yosemite, Grand Canyon, Williamsburg and other places. Interior would not put up any money for the needed transportation studies, necessary for the Refuge Master Plan nearing completion. Our Committee raised the money to pay the consultant, Barry Lawson Associates, of Concord, Mass., who has done previous work for the FWS Regional Office in Boston. The transportation study has been completed. With the number of visitors increasing about 5% each year and now numbering more than 1.5 million, the Refuge has less staff than it had six years ago, but it needs are greater to maintain the Refuge and provide for visitors. We sponsor three Student Conservation Assn. volunteers there.

The transportation consultants recommend that there be a fee system for parking as being absolutely essential and that some sort of van or bus transportation be instituted without delay as the situation will only get worse, not better. They had 4 hour closures getting out to the beach, and cars waited over 1 1/2 hours for a parking space at the beach on the week-end of July 4th.

Obviously, any fee should go to the Refuge for maintenance and personnel -- and to pay the people who collect the fees. The road to the beach is in bad need of repair, and any storm could destroy the beach parking areas. The Refuge is really hurt for money, as is the National Seashore. The only National Wildlife Refuge that has more visitors is Merritt Island, at Cape Canaveral, and with the shuttle system shut down, Chincoteague will probably be the most heavily visited this year.

In closing, we support Senator Durenberger's bill, with the return of funds collected to the Parks, and feel Refuges should be included in any fee schedule.

Judith C. Johnson

Judith C. Johnson, President

July 17, 1986 The Va. Beachcomber PAGE 15

Assateague report reccomends shuttle system

By Cheryl Nowak

A recently released consultant's report of the traffic situation relative to the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge on Assateague recommends that a shuttle system be established and a parking or entrance fee be implemented.

The report, completed by the Massachusetts policy planning and community relations firm of Barry Lawson Associates, and funded by the Committee to Preserve Assateague Island, also recommends that the Tom's Cove Beach parking lot be retained, an absolute limit to the refuge visitor parking be established and off-refuge parking facilities be established.

According to the report, "To accomplish this series of important steps, a cooperative planning program must be developed with active and productive involvement of those who have major interests in using and managing the Refuge consistent with national mandates."

With respect to the recommended shuttle system, the Lawson report notes, "This service can work effectively if certain steps are followed. The most important of these is the encouragement of service from the high density points of origin, namely the larger campgrounds on the island. Efficient service (such as vans) from Tom's Cove Campground alone could greatly alleviate the need for more parking spaces."

The report further suggests that shuttle services from other points on Chincoteague "can be a logical step" once the initial system is established.

The report makes note of the 1976 Vollmer report which also recommended the establishment of a shuttle system. According to the Lawson document, "For a number of reasons the Vollmer recommendations were not implemented by the National Park Service."

The Lawson report ties its recommendation for institution of an entrance fee to its support for shuttle system, noting, "The absence of a fee... means that there is no economic way for the park managers to influence travel patterns, to have a source of funding to reimburse them for reconstruction and damage due to storms and wear and tear, and perhaps most importantly, no incentive is provided for a would-be entrepreneur to institute a shuttle system."

The document notes, "To provide a control on traffic, and an added incentive for shuttle services, a parking fee must be instituted at the major parking facilities, irrespective of their location and management."

According to the report, "The Fish & Wildlife Service is currently seeking Congressional authority to institute an entrance fee."

The Lawson report maintains that its recommendations "increase the range of transportation choices available for visitors and residents," while balancing the competing needs to improve mobility and preserve the environment.

As a backdrop to their recommendations, the report developers cite the current traffic problems which affect the Assateague/Chincoteague area. These include "a demand for parking spaces that exceeds supply on high visitor days," which results in parking along the access route and cars waiting in line" for the exit of vehicles in a one-out one-in system of traffic management."

Also noted as a problem is the "vulnerability of the current large parking area at Tom's Cove to coastal storms." According to the report, "the current parking facility including the bathouse and auxiliary buildings is likely to be under water in 25 years."

Predicting a continued increase in tourist visitation to the area, the report contends that all interested parties must realize how important it is that they "share in the cost of dealing with the associated traffic problem, just as each benefits from, or has a stake in, the quality of the area. None of the government parties involved has sufficient resources to underwrite the costs of unlimited parking and/or shuttle services. Therefore, cost (and who incurs it) is an important, perhaps the critical, element of the decision analysis."

The report later defines "those who have major interests" in the issue as the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Town of Chincoteague, Accomack County and the general region, Virginia, and such groups as the chamber of commerce and the Committee to Preserve Assateague Island.

The report concludes that "a form of cost sharing is appropriate and necessary in this situation to respond to the size of the investments and commitments required to solve the traffic management problem, because the benefits from the Chincoteague Wildlife area are distributed among several parties, as a result of the specific goals of all involved."

While specifying its recommendations for traffic management in the Chincoteague area, the report also presents various other options which planners might choose to adopt. These include various combinations of refuge and off-refuge parking and shuttle arrangements, as well as the option to take no action at all.

Barry R. Lawson, president of Barry Lawson Associates, Inc., sent a copy of the final report to Gib Chase of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Chase is serving as coordinator for the Assateague land use master plan which is due out at the end of this month.

In its findings, the Lawson report comments on the master planning process, maintaining, "The Master Plan for the Refuge must be completed and be as comprehensive as possible regarding traffic circulation and vehicular parking." The report also suggests that the master plan include the limit of visitor parking to be permitted on the refuge.

Commenting on his group's report, Lawson suggested that "action be taken soon to implement (the report's) recommendations, because the traffic situation will only get worse, the costs of solutions will increase and feasible options will become more limited over time."

Judith Johnson, president of the Committee to Preserve Assateague Island, called on the many parties interested in the future of Chincoteague to "start working together to improve our mutual understanding of the problems which must be addressed."

6280 Alamosa Ln
Bozeman, Mt. 59715
June 22, 1986

1986 JUN 26 AM 8:42

Hon. Malcolm Wallop, Ch.
SubCommittee on Public Lands, Reserved
Water & Resource Conservation
Senate Dirksen Office Bldg. Rm 385
Washington D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Wallop:

I wish to record my general support of S2130, National Park System Resources Preservation and Revitalization Act of 1986.

I have recently retired as Supt. of Glacier National Park after 30½ years in the NPS, 20 years of which was spent in management positions in field locations including Grand Teton, Yellowstone, Glacier, Big Bend and Natchez Trace. I have also served in Rocky Mountain NP ans Sequoia Kings Canyon National Parks.

Over the years many Superintendents have been ambivalent about efforts to have fee collection revenues returned to general park operations. This comes from recognition that Congress reserves the right to determine funding levels for park operations and that returned revenue would simply replace otherwise appropriated funds and there would be no effective advantage over the present system.

I support the proposal to have revenues returned for specific enhancement of Research, Resource Management and Interpretation. These activities get eroded in subtle ways that can go unnoticed until a crisis occurs.

As more and more people come to the Parks the Service will continue to serve them and provide for their enjoyment - some times at the expense of the resource. It is one half of the NPS mandate and Congress will insist this be carried out, without closure of parks or significant reduction in services. The other half of the mandate is more difficult to accomplish- but even more important if we are to preserve parks for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations.

This year (1986) in Glacier National Park, for instance, the Resource Management/Research base will start a significant decline that will accelerate in the near future under the forthcoming budget constraints. ie. Water Quality and Air Quality sampling will be reduced by 50%, rehabilitation of disturbed areas eliminated, exhotic (non-native) plant control eliminated (leavy spurge & spotted knapweed), research essentially on hold, reduced interpretive services - and more.

A good strong interpretive program is essential to help the visitor experience and understand the parks and the issues they face so that they will be informed and supportive of the need for their protection and care

The requirement of the bill to address a minimum of 100 critical resource problems a year to a maximum of $12,000,000 may not be possible to match.

I see no need for a "Fee Free Day" once each month.

The bill omits training for Maintenance Managers. I would recommend they be included in training along with all the others mentioned as maintenance activities have a great impact on the resource.

I have serious apprehensions about a separate research group independent of park management as proposed. So often when activities get centralized they do not serve the field very well. I believe research should be responsible to park management to be effective just as much as any other field activity. Central offices then have responsibility for oversite review. When Central offices have prime responsibility there is no oversite.

I would suggest conferring with several senior superintendents before finalizing this arrangement (ie. Yellowstone, Yosemite,Everglades, Great Smokies, Glacier).

And finally without the passage of the proposed legislation -hopefully amended as noted- my experience leads me to conclude that park resources will continue to deteriate.

Thankyou.

Sincerely yours,
Robert C. Haraden
Robert C. Haraden